The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXXII OCTOBER, 1946 No. 3

REACTIONS TO THE FIRST MISSIONARIES IN NORTHWEST AFRICA[1]

Missionary work in the Saracen lands was for St. Francis and his earliest followers a highly important duty and task; so important was it that he included in his rule a special chapter on missionary activity, "De euntibus inter saracenos et alios infideles." In those lands the opportunities for work were numerous: millions of Moslems could be converted, innumerable heretics could be won back for the Church, untold dangers and tortures, even death and martyrdom, could be suffered, nay, enjoyed by those who went. Among the Moslem countries Northwest Africa always stood out as a singularly important missionary field in the plans of St. Francis and his friends. St. Francis himself hoped to bring the gospel to the Moslem leader of Morocco, Caliph Muḥammed al-Nāṣir (1199-1214). For that purpose he traveled through Spain in the winter of 1213-1214, but he was unable to continue to Africa because of illness at the port of debarcation.[2] In 1219, at the pentecostal chapter, St. Francis entrusted the perilous mission to Africa to Brother Vitalis and his five companions. Illness prevented Brother Vitalis from leaving Spain,

[1] The writer wishes to express his gratitude to John B. Wuest, O.F.M., recently appointed as American assistant to the Minister-General of the Franciscans in Rome, for his kindness in permitting him to use the excellent library of Holy Family Monastery, Oldenburg, Indiana. He also wishes to thank Mr. Richard Grant for his introduction to that village and its famous institution. Similarly, he expresses his gratitude to the Committee of the Charles Phelps Taft Memorial Fund at the University of Cincinnati for the grant-in-aid which permitted the completion of this brief study.

[2] Johannes Jörgensen, *Saint Francis of Assisi* (New York, 1940), p. 163.

but the others eventually went to Morocco, where they used every opportunity to preach Christianity and to condemn Islam. Caliph Abū-Ya'ḳūb Yūsuf II (1214-1223) naturally opposed their transgression of Moslem law and their criticism of the Moslem faith, but withheld serious punishment. On two occasions he gave them the opportunity to leave for Ceuta and thence for their Christian homeland. But finally he was so provoked by their repeated public appearances and preaching that he decapitated them with his own hands. This was on January 16, 1220.[3] In the same year Brother Giles and Brother Electus with unnamed companions went to Tunis. Brother

[3] Pierre de Cenival, "L'église chrétienne de Marrakech au XIIIe siècle" in *Hespéris*, VII (1927), 69, suggests that they suffered martyrdom less for having preached the Gospel than for having insulted Mohammed. The main source for the martyrdom of these friars is found in *Analecta Franciscana*, III (1897), Appendix I, 579-596, under the title "Passio sanctorum martyrum fratrum Beraldi, Petri, Adiuti, Accursii, Othonis in Marochio martyrizatorum." Hereafter the *Analecta* will be referred to as *AF*. A short version is found in the regular *Chronica generalium ministrorum ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, pp. 15-22, of the same volume of the *AF*. Karl Müller has also published the account of an eyewitness in his *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und der Bussbruderschaften* (Freiburg, 1885), pp. 207-210, which has been reprinted recently by Odulphus Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen und ihre Weiterentwicklung im nahen Orient und in den mohammedanischen Ländern während des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Werl, 1934), pp. 246-248. The title of the account reads "Martirium quinque fratrum Minorum apud Marochium, de quibus in vita beati Antonii. . . . " Hereafter this account will be referred to as *Martirium*. Jordanus de Giano mentions it only very briefly and without date, *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, edited by H. Boehmer in *Collection d'Études et de Documents*, VI (1908), no 7. Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate vitae beati Francisci ad vitam Domini Jesu* in *AF*, IV (1906), 322 ff., has nothing to add for the purpose of this study. A few lines on it are found in *Chronica Fratris Nicolai Glassberger* in *AF*, II (1887), 13ff. Marcus of Lisbon has an extensive, but also later, account. The edition used for this investigation is the German translation of Carl Kurtz von Senfftnaw, *Der Cronicken der eingesetzten Orden des Heyligen Vatters Francisci* (Constanz am Bodensee, 1604). Marcus includes the story in Book IV, chs. 1-28. Another extensive and similarly later account is by Lucas Waddingus, *Annales Minorum* (27 volumes, Quaracchi, 1931-1934), I, *anno* 1219, nos. 49-54; *anno* 1220, nos. 40-57. In contrast, only a passing mention of it is made by Odorico Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici* (22 volumes, Rome, 1646), XIII, *anno* 1219, no. 56. Marianus de Florentia in his *Compendium chronicarum Fratrum Minorum* gives only a few lines to the five martyrs of Morocco and to Brother Giles, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, II (1909), 96. Hereafter this work will be referred to as *AFH*.

Giles was ejected from the city to prevent his preaching and Brother Electus, separating himself from Brother Giles, suffered martyrdom several years later.[4] The work of another group in Ceuta was short-lived; after one day of preaching they also suffered martyrdom, on October 10, 1227.[5] In the narratives describing the preaching and martyrdom of these earliest friars in Northwest Africa there are numerous

---

Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, pp. 42-44, places some doubt upon the validity of the date 1219, but admits difficulties with 1218 also. He continues to use the traditional date 1219. His date for the death of the five friars, January 1, 1220, on page 49, is, unfortunately, a typographical error.

[4] Jörgensen, *op. cit.*, pp. 196ff. This experience of Brother Giles is found in the regular chronicle of the order, *AF*, III, 78, in the "Vita fratris Aegidii, viri sanctissimi et contemplativi." Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate vitae*, in *AF*, IV, 207ff., 499ff., adds nothing to the account of the regular chronicle. Wadding, too, has only a brief account in *Annales Minorum*, I, *anno* 1219, no. 34. Little or nothing on the Tunis mission is found in the various versions of Brother Leo's *Vita beati Fratris Aegidii*: Leonardus Lemmens, *Documenta antiqua Franciscana, pars* 1, (Quaracchi, 1901), pp. 37-63; Walter W. Seton, *Blessed Giles of Assisi* in British Society of Franciscan Studies, VIII (1918), 51-89; Henricus Bulletti, "De Vita B. Aegidii Assisiensis auctore Fratre Leone iuxta novum codicem" in *AFH*, VIII (1915), 12-22. The sources for Brother Electus and his martyrdom in Africa are very limited, vague as to time and place, and not important here. It is not even certain that he traveled to Tunis with Brother Giles; Wadding is the first to suggest it. The references are *AF*, III, 224; IV, 336; *Speculum perfectionis*, edited by Paul Sabatier in British Society of Franciscan Studies, XIII (1926-27), cap. 77; Thomas de Celano, *Vita secunda S. Francisci Assisiensis* in *AF*, X (1927), 250, cap. 158; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, I, *anno*, 1219, nos. 32 and 35.

[5] The main source is the narrative of an eyewitness, found in *AF*, III, Appendix I, 613-616, under the title "Passio sanctorum fratrum Danielis, Agnelli, Samuelis, Donnuli, Leonis, Nicolai, Hugolini Ordinis fratrum Minorum, qui passi sunt apud Septam, civitatem Marochiorum, anno Domini MCCXXVII." Again, a brief version is found in the regular *Chronica*, pp. 32ff. of the same volume. Wadding has an account in *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221 (instead of in the year 1227), nos. 35-42. Glassberger also has a brief account in *AF*, II, 44ff. Marianus de Florentia again devotes only a few lines to their martyrdom in his *Compendium* in *AFH*, II (1909), 99. Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate*, in *AF*, IV, 296ff. has a brief account. Ferdinand Delorme presents another version in his "Pour l'histoire des Martyrs du Maroc" in *La France Franciscaine*, VII (1924), 114-116. Marcus of Lisbon again offers an extensive account in *Cronicken*, Book IV, chs. 30-35. No references will be made to each one of these sources and versions (and to those mentioned in notes 3 and 4) unless they add to or detract from the argument of the text.

incidents that suggest the reactions of the Moslems and of the resident and itinerant Christians to the appearance and work of the Franciscans; to those incidents and reactions this study is directed.

The orders and the commissions, giving the missionaries the privilege and responsibility of working in Northwest Africa directed attention to both Christians and Moslems. However, emphasis was placed upon the work among the infidel Moslems, and the friars readily understood that their most important task was to bring the Christian faith to the unbelievers. At the general chapter of 1219, St. Francis announced his intention to send brothers to all parts of the world, those held by the faithful and by the unfaithful as well,[6] but the unfaithful Moslems were uppermost in his mind when he designated the specific areas for missionary work. The two pagan areas which he picked out for missionary work he selected because of the fury of the Moslems against the Christians, "quia in duabus orbis partibus furor Saracenorum contra Christianos fervebat, videlicet versus Orientem in partibus Syriae et versus Occidentem in Africa, rege Miramolino in Marochio saeviente."

Therefore, St. Francis planned to go to Damietta with twelve companions and to send other brothers to Morocco. The brothers who eventually went to Africa and there suffered martyrdom were Beraldus, Petrus, Adiutus, Accursius, and Otho; their leader, Vitalis, had to be left behind in Aragon because of illness. Furthermore, St. Francis in his address to Vitalis and the other brothers emphasized that they were to go to the land of the Saracens, to preach and confess God's faith, and to attack the Mohammedan law, "ad praedicandum et confitendum eius [Dei] fidem et legem Machometicam impugnandum," and he intimated that he, too, was going to preach to the infidels of other lands.[7] The brothers to whom he spoke understood well that he meant preaching to the Moslems; they pointed to their youthfulness

[6] *AF*, III, 581. These intentions in regard to his followers merely supplemented earlier plans in regard to himself. On two earlier occasions he had planned to preach to the Moslems. Thomas de Celano, *Vita Prima S. Francisci Assisiensis* in *AF*, X (1926), 42ff.

[7] This refers to his third missionary journey, the one to Damietta in the summer of 1219. Cf. Hermann Fischer, *Der heilige Franziskus von Assisi*

and unfamiliarity with the customs of the infidels and to their almost complete ignorance of the Arabic language, to the malicious hatred which the Moslems had toward the Christians and to the derision which they would suffer, but they added that they were prepared to go nevertheless.[8] In fact, according to one version, they had asked to go to the Saracens to spread the Christian gospel among them.[9]

When St. Francis sent Brother Giles and his companions to Tunis, he also did so with the wish of sending preachers to the Saracens and other infidels and of having them remain there, if it seemed necessary for the confession of the faith.[10] At Tunis a most pious and respected Saracen at once recognized the purpose of the Christian preachers, to him "homines infideles;" as he saw it, their aim was to condemn the Prophet and the Koran. So he urged his fellow-Moslems to action against Brother Giles and the other Franciscans, but the Christians in Tunis averted serious disturbance by hurrying Brother Giles out of the city. Nothing was mentioned about work among the Christians. In 1227 similarly Brother Daniel and his six companions went to Morocco to preach the faith to the Moslems; for them the most important task was to preach the word of God to the enemies of Christ.[11] About the same time Brother Electus and his companion must have worked among the Saracens of North Africa, before they

---

während der Jahre 1219-1221, in Freiburger Historische Studien, IV (1907), 20-42.

[8] *AF,* III, 582. Later, however, one of them, Beraldus, was described as "Minister autem verbi erat frater Beraldus, qui noverat Saracenorum idioma." *Ibid.,* 585. Wadding, *Annales Minorum,* I, *anno* 1219, no. 49, wrote more emphatically "Frater Berardus perite callebat linguam Arabicam. . . ."

[9] *Martirium* "Petita ergo licentia secundum formam regule sue ad eundem inter Saracenos, ut in eis si quo modo possent domino fructificare terram ipsorum. . . ." (p. 207). But the same account also refers to their fears: "Discipuli sumus. . . ." (p. 208).

[10] *AF,* III, 78: "cupiebat causa praedicationis fratres aliquos mittere ad Saracenos et alios infideles, et ut pro confessione fidei, si foret necessitas, morerentur . . . ipsum ad gentes barbaras destinavit."

[11] *Ibid.,* 613: "volentes ire ad terram Marochiorum ad praedicandum fidem catholicam Saracenis." Cf. also p. 614. The chronicler wrote: "ut irent Marochium ad partes infidelium, ut ibi semen spargerent catholicae veritatis" (p. 32). Glassberger and Wadding also indicate their strong desire for martyr-

finally met death at their hands. For St. Francis and his immediate followers, then, the most important work in Northwest Africa was the conversion of the Moslems; work among the Christians was incidental to this, the main task.

The missionary work in Northwest Africa also received the attention of Pope Honorius III. In several of his letters he indicated an interest in both the resident Christians and the native Moslems. On June 10, 1225, he acceded to the request of Dominicus and Martinus, both Dominicans, and sent them to Morocco, Tunis, and south Spain, all three still under Moslem rule and very likely included under the papal phrase of "in terra Miramamolini;"[12] actually their destination was Morocco. There the two men were to preach Jesus Christ, to baptize the Saracens newly-converted to the faith, to enjoin penitence, and to publish the sentence of excommunication. Both Wad-

---

dom, which would point to their work among the Moslems. *AF*, II, 44; *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221, no. 36.

[12] Actually they worked in Morocco, but they apparently could have extended their endeavors to include the other lands of the Almohade ruler of the time. Petrus Pressutti, *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1888, 1895), II, no. 5527, permits both interpretations. "Fratri Dominico priori fratrum Praedicatorum et fratri Martino in regno Marroccano a Sede Apostolica destinatis. Iuxta eorum supplicationis instantiam eos in terra Miramamolini destinat. . . ." Augustus Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1874f.), I, 640, no. 7429, has only "in regnum Marrochianum . . . destinatis," which would limit them to Morocco. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1225, no. 28, also permits both interpretations. In his own text he uses "in Miramolini regnum," but in reference to the letter of June 10, which he does not give, he uses "regnum Marrochianum." Furthermore in his own text he suggests that Pope Honorius III sent both Franciscans and Dominicans to preach the true faith; in connection with the letter of June 10 he limits the order to the Dominicans. In the letter of October 7, which he says is identical with the earlier one, he gives the more extensive "regnum Miramolini" in two instances. Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, XIII, *anno* 1225, par. 44, gives "Miramomelini" twice. *Analecta sacri ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, III (1897), 374, no. 132, is only an abbreviated version of the *in extenso* account in Pressutti. "Miramamolinus" and similar names refer to the title "Amīr al-Mu' minīn," leader, lord, or commander of the faithful. *Cf. Encyclopedia of Islam*, I, 330ff. Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, pp. 137, 205, has June 16 instead of June 10; so has Berthold Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Habelschwerdt, 1924), p. 98.

ding and Raynaldus find reason to extend these tasks to include converting the unbelievers, comforting the weak, consoling the faint-hearted, bringing back into the Church those who have fallen away; Wadding alone mentions the right of absolving from excommunication those who could not comfortably appear before the Holy See in person. On October 7 of the same year Pope Honorius addressed a letter to both Franciscans and Dominicans whom he was sending to Moslem lands, "in regnum Miramamolini," giving them similar instructions, i. e., to preach Jesus Christ, to baptize the newly-converted Saracens, to reconcile the apostates, to urge penitence, to absolve the excommunicates who could not conveniently appear in person before the Holy Father, and to excommunicate those whom the Pope should designate as heretics.[13] Later in the same month, he again sent a letter to Dominicus, now described as bishop in the kingdom of Miramolinus, admonishing him of his duties toward both Christians and unbelievers.[14] In February of the next year the same Pope placed the Christians and the missionary work in Morocco under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Roderico of Toledo. He suggested that the latter send both Dominicans and Franciscans to work among the Moroccan Christians, captives and others, many of whom were in

[13] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I (Rome, 1759), 24, no. 23; Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 5682; Potthast, *Regesta*, I, no. 7490.

[14] In the letter of June 10 (cf. note 12) he was referred to as "priori fratrum Praedicatorum," in the one of October 27, as "episcopo in regno Miramamolini commoranti." Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 5701; *Analecta O. P.*, III, 374f., no. 135. Conrad Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, 3 vols. (Regensburg, 1913), I, 263, under Giennen (Beatien, Baeza) refers to him as Dominicus de Baeza O. Praed. as bishop up to 1236, but gives no date for the beginning of his episcopacy. Pius B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1931), p. 38, has placed the "1236" into the accession instead of the death column. Eubel suggests that he used the first edition of Gams, but does not indicate whether the same error existed there. I have not seen the first edition. At least, 1225 seems to be the date for the accession of Dominicus to the episcopacy. If "regnum Miramolini" includes Morocco, as suggested previously, then Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, p. 178, is misleading in saying that the Moroccan bishops were exclusively Franciscan in the thirteenth century. Dominicus was not bishop of Morocco, but Morocco was part of his diocese. Cf. Atanasio Lopez, "Los Obispos de Marruecos desde el siglo XIII", in *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, XIV (1920), 402-405, and Altaner, *Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 99ff.

danger of falling away from the faith. They were to regain the fallen, comfort the weak, and strengthen the strong; by preaching, prayer, and example they were to convert the infidels.

However, the infidel Moslems received less attention from Honorius than did the Christians. Furthermore, since the Christians were dispersed over a wide area, Roderico was allowed to appoint a bishop or two in the land of the Saracens.[15] Within a month Pope Honorius emphasized the work among the Christians to the complete exclusion of work among the Moslems. To the friars residing among the Moslems he permitted several deviations from the rules of their order; he allowed them to change their habits, to raise beards and full heads of hair, and, more strikingly than these, to receive and pay out money for their food and clothes. These changes were made not in the interest of greater missionary work among the Moslems, but for the promotion of increased activity among the Christians; the new proposals expedited visits to the resident and imprisoned Christians and facilitated the giving of counsel and the administering of the sacraments.[16] In the *Passio* of the seven martyrs of Ceuta there is a reference to a Franciscan and a Dominican having come from the interior parts of the Saracen country, but no mention is made of those among whom they worked. Possibly they had been sent out by Archbishop Roderico.[17] The letters of Pope Honorius imposed upon the Dominicans and Franciscans the task of working among the Christians and Moslems; in general, the work among the Moslems was emphasized less than in the commissions to the Franciscans.[18] Both the papal initiative in the matter and the emphasis upon the

[15] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I, 24ff., no. 24; Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 5836; *Analecta O. P.*, III, 376, no. 137.

[16] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I, 26, no. 25; *Analecta O. P.*, III, 376, no. 138; Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 5865: "non tam ad declinandum ad tempus gentis barbarae feritatem, que in Christianos crudelius debacchatur; quam etiam ut prodesse pluribus, et liberius visitare Christianos in carceribus, et locis aliis valeatis, ad injungendum eis poenitentiam, dandum salutis monita, et exhibendum ecclesiastica sacramenta."

[17] *AF*, III, 614.

[18] His successor, Pope Gregory IX, in a letter of May 27, 1233, expressed his hope for the conversion of a caliph of his day. *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I,

missionary work among the Christians were indicative of a new papal policy.

The Franciscans in their missionary activities followed the commissions given to them. Even though the friars found hospitality with the Christians and even though they occasionally preached to them, they directed their greatest efforts to the Moslems. Already on the way the five Franciscans of 1219 carried out their task. In Seville in their own habits they attempted to enter the principal mosque on a Moslem holy day in order to preach; hindered in this by the angry Moslems, they betook themselves to the palace of the king. In conversation with him they very explicitly outlined their mission and carried it out just as vigorously. Asked about their purpose, they replied that they had been sent to him for the good of his soul and to inform him that he ought to abandon his faith in Mohammed, that most despicable of prophets, that he ought to believe and be baptized in Jesus Christ, without Whom he could not be saved. At the same time they warned him that he as the leader of the iniquitous Moslem faith was the worst among the bad and as such the certain recipient of greater punishment in hell. They added force to their preaching by refusing to deny their own faith and to accept Islam, even in the face of death. And from their prison-tower they continued to preach to the visitors of the court, upholding their own faith and damning the precepts and practices of Islam.[19] Eventually, in Morocco itself, they took every occasion to preach to the Moslems, declaring the law of Mohammed base and useless, and only the law of Christ soul-

---

106f., no. 106. Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, p. 203, suggests that Pope Innocent III in a letter of August 3, 1198, urged a caliph of that time to accept the Christian faith. Earlier in the same year, on March 8, the same Pope in a letter to "illustri Miramolino regi Marochetano" concluded with the hope "Inspiret autem vobis ille qui via veritas est et vita ut, agnita veritate, quae Christus est, ad eam venire quantocius festinetis." Cf. Louis de Mas Latrie, *Traités de paix et de commerce et documents divers concernant les relations des Chrétiens avec les Arabes de l'Afrique septentrionale au moyen âge* (Paris, 1866), *Documents*, pp. 7-9.

[19] *AF*, III, 17, 584ff. Bartholomeus de Pisa and the *Martirium* have the same version in nearly the same form.

saving, and this they did in spite of the prohibition of the caliph. When they were evicted from the city and sent to Ceuta for transportation to Christian lands, they dismissed the Christian servants who accompanied them, returned to Morocco, and reassumed their preaching in the market-place. Even after a twenty-day imprisonment, without food and drink, they were ready to continue their missionary work immediately upon obtaining their freedom. For the second time they were evicted from the city and again they returned from the route to Ceuta. In spite of a restrictive policy of the Christians, the friars again went out to preach, but they were soon apprehended and imprisoned by the Moslems. Before the caliph they brought an argument, that might be convincing to him, by referring to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and other patriarchs, i. e., to those who were common to Christianity and Islam.[20] Even in prison, in the midst of flagellations and torture they reprimanded and warned their Moslem captors and guards; neither the promises of wealth and position nor the caliph's wiles and threats stopped them in their glorification of Christ and Christianity. To Abū-Ya 'ḳūb Yūsuf and his court they continued to foretell certain damnation because of their belief in Mohammed and promised certain salvation if they would believe in Jesus Christ and be baptized. To the end the friars carried out their commission to preach to the Moslems. They did so under all circumstances, even in defiance of the Moslem law. That persistence in preaching finally brought them martyrdom at the hands of the caliph himself on January 16, 1220.[21]

The other two Franciscan missionary efforts in Northwest Africa permit the same conclusion, although not as definite because of the shorter historical versions. The venture of Brother Giles at Tunis in 1219 and the martyrdom of the seven friars at Ceuta in 1227 show

[20] *Martirium*, p. 209.

[21] *AF*, III, 588ff. Here seemingly the chronicler of the *Passio* extended his narrative. Neither Bartholomew nor the *Martirium* suggests that the friars had an opportunity to preach publicly to the Moslems; neither records the evictions from the city, the subsequent returns from Ceuta, and the twenty-day imprisonment. The arrest and torture, the trial and martyrdom, are common to all accounts. On the Moslem laws against the preaching of Chrisitanity to the Moslems cf. Willi Heffening, *Das islamische Fremdenrecht* (Hanover, 1925).

also that the main task of the missionaries was work among the Moslems, not among the Christians. Brother Giles had little opportunity to carry out his mission, but in the limited time at his disposal he emphasized his first thought. When ejected from the city and forced to board a ship in the harbor, he and his companions preached to the Saracens from the ship and urged the Moslems to be converted to Christ. But, realizing that they could not fulfill what they had come to do, they returned to Italy.[22] In 1227 Brother Daniel and six companions left Tuscany for Ceuta in Morocco with a similar intention, "quae intendebant perficere, scilicet, inimicis Christi verbum Domini praedicare."[23] In spite of the restrictions placed upon them, they made preparations for their task, and when ready they stole secretly out of the Christian quarter into the heart of the Saracen city, openly confessing the name of God and proclaiming that in no other was there true salvation.[24] Almost immediately they were molested and stoned; eventually they were apprehended, imprisoned, and tortured for eight days. Even, then, before the caliph they continued with their mission. Asked whether they were ready to retract whatever they had said against the Koran and Mohammed, whether they were willing to deny Christ and accept Islam, they, especially Daniel, re-emphasized what they had previously preached, that there was no salvation in the Koran of the Moslems, and that the Moslems could not be saved except by being baptized and by believing in the Lord Jesus Christ. In contrast, Mohammed with all his followers would be sunk into hell, and he as the minister of Satan was the cause of eternal death of his followers.[25] To the judge and interpreter Daniel

[22] *AF*, III, 78: "Fratres vero contra voluntatem et prohibitionem eis de navi praedicabant, et ut converterentur ad Christum, audacter hortabantur. . . . Videntes autem, quod Christianis impedientibus illud, pro quo venerant, non poterant adimplere, reversi sunt ad beatum Franciscum."

[23] *Ibid.*, 614.

[24] *Ibid.*, 614: "itaque sic armati milites Christi bellum aggressi sunt die dominica summo mane clam civitatem intrantes, cinere conspersis capitibus et per mediam civitatem imperterriti, Spiritus sancti robore confortati, nomen Domini confitentes per plateam hinc inde discurrebant clamantes, quod non est in alio vera salus."

[25] *Ibid.*, 615.

suggested that he had better be converted to the Christian faith to be saved, since he certainly realized by this time that he had been duped by the errors of the Koran. In and out of court the seven friars pointed out the damnable results of the belief in Mohammed and his religion, even though they were threatened with capital punishment for their assertions. The seven friars of Ceuta, like Brother Giles at Tunis and the five martyrs of Morocco, heroically, and at times defiantly, followed the example and precept of their great leader, to work and preach among the Moslems of North Africa. In that service they were willing to suffer martyrdom.

In contrast to the many episodes in the missionary work among the Moslems, there were only two instances in which the friars preached to the Christians, and both occasions were exceptional. When the friars of 1219-1220 were in prison, awaiting their execution, they preached to other imprisoned Christians and heretics.[26] Later on in 1227 at Ceuta, Daniel and three brothers preached to the Genoese, Pisan, and Marseillaise merchants, and others who were present in the Christian quarter just outside the city. But this preaching was only "per aliquantulum spatium temporis" and came at the beginning of the friars' stay in Ceuta, while they were awaiting the arrival of the other brothers from Tarragona.[27] Both instances under such peculiar circumstances hardly suggest that the friars spent much time upon the resident Christians in Northwest Africa.[28]

[26] *Ibid.*, 587: "Qui in carcere existentes tam Christianis quam haereticis verbum Dei ferventes praedicabant." Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate*, p. 322, has simply: ". . . in peiori carcere sunt reclusi, ubi biduo permanentes carceratis Christum Dominum evangelizabant." The *Martirium* reads: "ubi etiam concarceratis suis verbum Dei iugitur predicabant." There was one other similar instance, but mentioned only by Marcus of Lisbon. He says that on the route from Aragon to Portugal the friars preached at proper places and times to the orthodox Christians and to the heretics who at the time were numerous in Spain. *Cronicken*, Book IV, ch. 2.

[27] *Ibid.*, 613. Bartholomeus de Pisa and the Delorme version say that they remained with the Christians for three days, preaching to them during that time.

[28] This of course does not mean that the Church did not give attention to these resident Christians. Pope Honorius III on September 5, 1219, made a special plea on their behalf in a letter addressed to Caliph Abū-Ya ʿḳūb Yūsuf, asking that the resident Christians be allowed to worship and live according to Christian

The early Franciscan visits to Northwest Africa, then, were real missionary efforts, directed to the conversion of the Moslems. The narratives certainly suggest that the friars carried out their orders implicitly and suffered ejection or martyrdom in consequence of their work.

The reactions of the Moslems and the Christians to the appearance and work of the friars cannot be described with a categorical statement. One could expect that the friars would encounter opposition at the hands of the infidel Moslems and one should expect that they would receive a hearty welcome and support from the Christians. Neither was the case. Even though the friars had no outstanding success in their preaching to the Moslems, they found sympathy and respect among some of them. Although they received a welcome and hospitality from their fellow-Christians, they also experienced hindrance and opposition from them.

The success which the friars had in their preaching to the Moslems is hard to estimate. The three accounts describing the mission of 1219-1220 give evidence of failure and success, even though some differences exist between the *Passio* and the other two accounts. The attitude of the leaders bespoke of no success at all, and the same attitude was found among the Saracens in general, but the actions of some of the Moslems suggested sympathy and tolerance, even though no conviction. The martyrdom of the five friars in 1220 and of the seven in 1227 was proof for the attitude of the leaders. Abū-Ya'ḳūb in fact took delight in inviting and forcing the Christians to dine and eat meat with him on fast days and during fast periods like Lent.[29] Preaching conditions for the friars certainly were no better several

---

law and custom. Pressutti, *Regesta*, I, no. 2190; Potthast, *Regesta*, I, 536, no. 6121; Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, XIII, *anno* 1219, par. 46. Later on, as appears in the text, more attention was given to the Christians than to the Moslems. Of the work of those sent out by Pope Honorius we, unfortunately, have no detailed accounts.

[29] Upon petition of these Christians Pope Honorius III on May 13, 1223, released them from the observance of these fast days under those circumstances. Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 4352; Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, XIII, *anno* 1223, par. 55.

years later. Again the missionaries had to resort to subterfuges to enter the country and to carry on their work. In 1226, Pope Honorius permitted the friars deviations from their rules to avoid detection by the Moslems, so that they might more freely visit the imprisoned Christians and more readily give them and other Christians the word of salvation and the sacraments.[30] All accounts agree upon the vengeance and fury which the Saracen mob wreaked upon the remains of the martyrs. They dragged the bodies through the streets, trampled them under foot, and mangled them as much as possible. When the Christians sought to collect the remains to provide them with a Christian burial, the Moslems maligned and stoned them.[31] Pope Honorius III, writing in 1226, also referred to the ferocity of the Saracen mob that persecuted most cruelly those who professed Christianity, and was sympathetic to the friars who feared to carry their ministerial gowns and sacramental vessels through a hostile country.[32]

But some of the officials displayed another attitude. In the *Passio* there are three instances which depict the sympathy and understanding of some of the Moslems. An advisor of the king was certainly sympathetic. When consulted he suggested that the Christians be freed, because the terrific heat-wave over the land was possibly the result of their imprisonment, and the narrator pointedly added that he looked upon the Christian faith with favor.[33] Similarly another Mos-

[30] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I, 26, no. 25; Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 5865; Potthast, *Regesta*, I, 650, no. 7550. That the Moslem leaders did not always display a friendly attitude toward the Christians in their domains can be seen from the repeated papal requests for their protection and security. Cf. Mas Latrie, *Traités de paix et de commerce, Documents*, pp. 13-17.

[31] *AF*, III, 590. There existed also the legend that the caliph, after a famine of five years, repented of his murder of the five friars and granted the Franciscans the right to found five churches and establish a bishopric in Morocco. Cf. Cenival, "L'église chrétienne de Marrakech," pp. 69ff.; Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, p. 204.

[32] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I, 24ff., no. 24.

[33] *AF*, III, 586: "Et tunc fuit consultum regi per Ababoturim Saracenum, qui fidem Christianorum videbatur diligere, quod illos fratres a carcere liberaret, quia forte propter eos tempestas ingruerat supradicta." The short version, p. 18, has only "qui Christianos diligere videbatur." This incident is not found elsewhere.

lem prince displayed a willingness to assist them, thereby risking his own life and position. This prince, when ordered by the ruler to apprehend and execute the friars, delayed with the execution from the third hour to vespers, so almost all day, in the hope that the Christian residents would successfully plead with the caliph to revoke the cruel sentence.[34] After Beraldus in a more or less miraculous fashion had uncovered a spring to quench the thirst of the company, both Christians and Moslems kissed the friars' feet and habits and thereafter held them in greater devotion and reverence, "et tunc eos in maiori devotione et reverentia habuerunt." After the death of the martyrs some Saracens "propter amicitiam," others, however, "propter lucrum," brought the mangled remains of the martyrs to the house of Don Pedro.[35] On the other hand, all accounts narrate the sympathy shown by the son of the King of Seville. He "misericordia motus," "illis compatiens," urged his father to reconsider his decree of capital punishment for the five friars who had come before him; the father did change the decree and eventually the friars were free to go on their way to Morocco.[36] In some instances greater freedom was allowed to the missionaries in their work among the Moslems. Brother Electus worked in North Africa for some time before his death, and the Dominican and the Franciscan noted in the *Passio* of 1227 certainly returned to Ceuta from work as missionaries, even though that is not specifically stated. The immediate success of the friars' preaching seems not to have been very great; certainly the appearance of the friars brought no improvement in the lot of the resident Christians and no increase in the number of converts. Only a few

[34] *Ibid.*, 587: ". . . quo rex iracundia stimulatus praecepit cuidam principi Saraceno . . . ut eos caperet et poena capitali puniret. Princeps vero ille eis condolens, ab hora tertia usque ad vesperos implere regis imperium distulit credens, quod aliqui nobiles Christiani regi supplicarent, ut tam crudelem sententiam revocaret." No other reference to this fact is made.

[35] *Ibid.*, 591. Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate*, p. 323, has simply "Corpora vero et capita christiani accipientes condiderunt aromatibus." The *Martirium* has nothing on this.

[36] *AF*, III, 585. The *Martirium*, p. 208, reads: "Filius ergo regis misericordia commotus super eos . . ." Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate*, p. 322, reads: "sed mitigatus a filio . . ."

Moslems were sympathetic to the cause of the friars and those few remained Moslems.[37]

The reactions of the resident Christians to the appearance and preaching of the friars among the Moslems were also varied. To the incoming preachers the Christians offered hospitality, at times out of generosity, at times out of fear. On some occasions this fear led to opposition to and final prohibition of further preaching among the Moslems. In 1219, at Seville, the friars for eight days enjoyed the hospitality and protection of a prominent Christian.[38] From there they traveled in the company of Petrus Fernandus, a Spanish and Christian nobleman, and other Christians, to Morocco, where they found lodging with Don Pedro.[39] The latter had fled before the wrath of his brother, King Alphonso II of Portugal, and had entered the military service of the King of Morocco.[40] He was described as a

[37] Altaner, *Dominikanermissionen*, pp. 234ff., gives the same conclusion on the Dominican efforts among all Moslems. However, Pope Gregory IX, on June 12, 1237, did write: "Laetamur quod ecclesia Marochitana, sterilis hactenus, fecunda nunc redditur, et synagoga peccantium, quae multos habebat filios, infirmatur." Mas Latrie, *Traités de paix et de commerce, Documents*, p. 11. There was the case of the young Saracen girl converted and baptized, not by the friars, but by the chaplain of Don Pedro. *AF*, III, 595.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 16ff., 584; Marcus of Lisbon, *Cronicken*, Book IV, ch. 5; Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate*, p. 322, gives two days as the time of the stay, but does not state the place or person. The *Martirium* has nothing at all.

[39] From a later description it seems that Petrus Fernandus had been in the service of the Moslem king, but had fallen into disgrace. *AF*, III, 588: "Qui multum perterriti ad quendam virum Petrum Fernandi Hispanum ibidem captivatum et longo tempore in curia pro seneschalco habitum. . . ." On page 590 another Petrus Fernandus appears: "maxime illo tempore dominus Petrus Infans praedictum miserat duos scutiferos ad forum, scilicet Petrum Fernandi et Martinum Alphonsi, qui a Saracenis statim fuerant interfecti."

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 580, 585ff. ". . . erat subsidium eiusdem contra alios infideles." The chronicler mentioned one military expedition undertaken by Don Pedro and a company of Christian and Moslem soldiers against a group of rebellious Saracens. The friars went along and Beraldus saved this company from death by thirst through his discovery of the spring. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, I, *anno* 1219, no. 53, has "Miramolini ducebat exercitus." Another Christian soldier in the caliph's employ appeared later. *AF*, III, 591. All accounts say that Don Pedro served as their host, but only the *Passio* account gives a reason for his residence in a Moslem country and a suggestion of his employment by the king.

"christianissimus vir;" he had his own chaplain and chapel, and his house seemed to be the center for the Christian community.[41] He received the friars with great love and devotion and provided them with food and shelter upon their arrival. His sympathy was aroused by their emaciated appearance, the result of their imprisonment and experiences in Seville, and so he urged them not to go on with their mission, hoping to save them from a similar or worse fate in Morocco. On the occasion of their two evictions from Morocco he provided them with Christian servants to lead the way and each time after their return from the route to Ceuta he took them in and again provided them with food and shelter. When the death of the friars at the hands of the king seemed imminent, he asked that the friars be permitted a burial among the Christians. And ultimately it was he who had two silver coffins made to ship the remains of the martyrs to Spain and Portugal.[42] Servants of Don Pedro and other Christians of the community searched for the remains of the holy men after their martyrdom and desecration by the Moslems; and they did so under considerable danger to themselves. According to the *Passio* the Sara-

---

Possibly the chronicler again expanded the narrative to bring in the miracle of Beraldus. That Christian soldiers very regularly entered the service of Moslem leaders can be seen in Mas Latrie, *Traités de paix et de commerce, Texte*, pp. 32ff.

[41] *AF*, III, 592: "Et istas reliquas tenebat in capella sua." Page 591: "commisit Iohanni Roberti canonico sanctae Crucis de Colimbra, capellano suo. . . ." Cenival, "L'église chrétienne de Marrakech," p. 73.

[42] *AF*, III, 590-592; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, I, *anno* 1219, no. 53. The appearance of these remains at the Church of Santa Croce in Coimbra, Portugal, persuaded St. Anthony of Padua, to leave the Canons Regular of St. Augustine for the Franciscans, to change his name from Ferdinand to Anthony, and to leave for Morocco to preach to the Moslems. But the accounts tell nothing of his preaching and suggest instead that his illness prevented any public appearances. His stay in Morocco adds nothing to the argument of this paper. Cf. Léon de Kerval, *Sancti Antonii de Padua vitae duae* (Paris, 1904), pp. 29-34; P. Beda Kleinschmidt, "Antonius von Padua," in *Franziskanische Studien*, XVIII (1931), 12ff.; Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, p. 50. Wadding places his account of the change in St. Anthony and his expedition into Morocco immediately after his narrative on the five friars. *Annales Minorum*, I *anno* 1220, nos. 54-57. The *Martirium* account published by Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 207ff., is part of a *Vita beati Antonii*. Bartholomeus de Pisa also ties it up with St. Anthony.

cens pelted them with so many stones that the sunlight was obscured as if by a hail-storm![43]

At Tunis, too, the friars found hospitality with the resident Christians.[44] In 1227, at Ceuta, Brother Daniel and his six companions stayed with the Genoese, Pisan, and Marseillaise merchants who resided in the foreign merchants' quarter just outside of the city proper.[45] When the friars suffered martyrdom, the Christians were disturbed lest the bodies remain unburied and completely neglected.[46] They collected the major part of the remains, even though the infamous Moslems had scattered them over the city, and secretly buried them with proper rites in the cemetery within the merchants' quarter.[47] In life and death the friars received attention and care among the resident Christians of Northwest Africa.

This care and solicitude given to the friars were not always rendered without selfish motives. At times the Christians feared for their own lives and for their profit from the commerce and trade, which they carried on with the Moslem merchants and caravan leaders. Several times, certainly, the Christians offered their hospitality to keep

[43] The *Passio* is certainly a mere expansion of the more prosaic accounts of Bartholomeus de Pisa, *De conformitate*, p. 323 and the *Martirium*, p. 209; *AF*, III, 590; one of the Christians suffered injury to one of his eyes, *ibid.*, 594; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, I, *anno* 1220, no. 41.

[44] *AF*, III, 78: "Christiani, qui ibi aderant, apud quos frater Aegiduus cum aliis fratribus morabatur."

[45] *Ibid.*, 614: "Morabantur autem sancti fratres cum aliis mercatoribus christianis in quodam vico extra moenia civitatis praedictae, quia nulli Christiano licitum erat ingredi civitatem sine Saracenorum licentia speciali."

[46] Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221 (erroneously), no. 41.

[47] *AF*, III, 616: "Fuerunt nihilominus eorum corpora miraculose per Christianos collecta pro maiori parte et reposita honorifice in Alfondagia, id est vico Ianuensium, Marsiliensium et Pisanorum, ubi ipsorum meritis miracula creberrima ostenduntur." Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221, no. 41, gives a little different version: "Quare Genuenses, Massilienses, et Pisani mercatores, illorum reliquias pro majori parte divitus colligentes, in Alfondega (quam Rodulphus villam sed vicum putat, verius dixisset reconditorium mercium venalium) Massiliensium commode et secreto condiderunt. Demum in vico Genuensium tumulatae. . . ." Glassberger, *AF*, II, 44ff.: "Quorum venerabilia Sanctorum capita et corpora, a Saracenis conquassata et dilacerata, a Christianis collecta sunt et in vico Ianuensium mercatorum honorifice tumulata."

the friars from arousing the king to action against all resident Christians. In some instances, too, this fear prompted and encouraged the Christians to obstruct and hinder the missionary efforts of the friars, usually without much success. Cases of these questionable, but nevertheless understandable, Christian acts occurred in each one of the three missionary journeys of the Franciscans.

In 1219, at the very beginning of their missionary journey, the five friars had to practice a subterfuge to obtain passage into Moslem Africa. Sancia, daughter of Sancio I of Portugal, gave the five friars secular habits to travel from Alemquer to Seville, because the Saracens would not have permitted them to travel through their lands had they recognized them as friars. Nor would the Christians have taken them on board ship for the crossing of the Straits, because they avoided giving any offense to the Saracens, especially to the Saracen merchants, with whom they carried on a profitable trade. The chronicler went on to say that the Christian merchants, had they known that the friars intended to preach to the Moslems, perhaps would have hindered them, because they loved riches more than the glory of God.[48] As was to be expected, the advent and preaching of the friars and their continued preaching in Morocco in spite of the prohibitions of the caliph displeased that leader considerably and he ordered them evicted from the city and sent to Christian lands. The servants of Don Pedro were commanded to take them to Ceuta and to see to their transshipment into Christian lands as quickly as possible.[49] But when the friars upon their return and after a twenty-day impris-

[48] *AF*, III, 16ff.; p. 584: "Et ideo, si scierent, eos ire ad praedicandum Saracenis, eos forte impedivissent, quia plus divitias quam Dei gloriam diligebant." Again Marcus of Lisbon is the only source to say that Sancia kept them long enough to grow a beard. *Cronicken*, Book IV, ch. 4. Similarly he is the only source to say that the Seville host of the friars attempted to dissuade them from going into the mosque, because of fear for himself and the other resident Christians. *Ibid.*, Book IV, ch. 5. Neither Bartholomeus nor the *Martirium* says anything about the friars' trip to Alemquer and from there to Seville. Yet in the *Martirium* account we have the statement: "Ibant autem discalciati et secundum formam habitus aliis dissimiles . . ." as if to suggest that they had changed from the regular usual attire, as they actually had according to the *Passio* account.

[49] *AF*, III, 585f.

onment wished to renew their preaching immediately, the Christians refused to permit their preaching and very clearly gave the reason for their refusal. They asserted that the preaching of the friars would arouse the king to such hatred against all resident Christians, that he would immediately condemn all to capital punishment.[50] When Beraldus disregarded their fears and prohibitions, the Christians stopped him forcibly and entrusted him and the other friars to Christian soldiers and guides to take them to Ceuta.[51]

The resident Christians were not so much worried about the friars as about themselves and their own lives. When the friars returned again, the Christians held counsel among themselves and deliberated upon their next action. After their discussion Don Pedro again took the friars into his home. But it was hardly hospitality this time, but rather incarceration; Don Pedro forbade them to appear in public and placed guards over them to keep them within doors. All these precautions were taken lest the danger of death threaten all the Christians, should the friars' further preaching arouse the king's anger to the boiling point.[52] The resident Christians were seeking the safety of their lives and the continuance of their economic pursuits. But when the friars escaped the vigilance of the guards and again preached to the indignation of the Moslem king, all Christians, nobles and others, feared for their lives and fled to their residences and remained behind locked doors. Within doors and very closely watched by the Saracens, they expected death because of the friars, recognizing that

[50] *Ibid.*, 18, 586: "Sed Christiani eos praedicare nullatenus permiserunt asserentes, regem tantum ex eorum praedicatione in Christianorum omnium, qui erant, odium provocandum, quod statim capitali sententia punirentur."

[51] The context certainly permits the conclusion that force was used to deter Beraldus. "Et tunc subridens frater Beraldus distulit populo praedicare; Christiani vero dederunt eis ductores quosdam Christianos, qui eos perducerent usque ad Septam." *Ibid.*, 586.

[52] *Ibid.*, 586: ". . . dictus dominus Petrus Infans eos in hospitio suo retinuit et prodire in publicum, adhibitis eis custodibus, non permisit, ne forte, ei amplius praedicarent, ira regis ebulliente, omnibus Christianis mortis periculum imminneret." A little later the chronicler was even more explicit, page 587: "Post haec cum reversi Marochium sancti fratres in hospitio domini Infantis, ne exirent ad praedicandum ut prius, custodirentur . . ."

the anger of the king had reached the explosive stage,[53] and after the death of the friars they remained within their houses for three days in fear of death, since two Christian soldiers sent out by Don Pedro had been killed by the Saracen mob.[54] There can be little question about the reaction of the Christian residents of Morocco to the preaching of the Franciscans. According to the extensive *Passio* account they stood in fear of their lives and did their best to stop their preaching and to hurry them out of the land.

The attitude of the Moroccan Christians was not a mere passing fancy, but it continued to express itself against later incoming missionaries. In 1225, Pope Honorius III recognized it when he sent Dominicans and Franciscans into Morocco. He forbade the Christians to evict the friars from the Moslem lands. At the same time he recognized the possibility that the Christians might use indirect means to deter and stop the work of the friars, for he rather emphatically warned the missionaries to deviate in no way from their duties.[55]

In 1219 the Christians at Tunis reacted similarly to the presence and preaching of Brother Giles and his companions. The Christians were seemingly connected with commerce in some way, as former factors who had taken up permanent residence there, as sedentary partners of European associates, or as middlemen between the Moslem caravan leaders and the Christian merchants who came to Tunis for sales and purchases.[56] When the Moslems took up arms against

[53] *Ibid.*, 587: "Tamen omnes Christiani, tam nobiles quam ignobiles, exceptis captivatis per Saracenos, tantam furiam in rege cognoscentes, prae timore ne, interficerentur, ad propria hospitia confugerunt, ubi firmatis fortiter ianuis latitabant . . . ita quos omnes mortem occasione dictorum fratrum exspectabant videntes iram regis adnodum ebullire."

[54] *Ibid.*, 590.

[55] *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I, 24, no. 23: "Inhibemus quoque, ne cui Christiano liceat vos de terra illa ejicere violenter. Praecipimus autem vobis in virtute sanctae obedientiae, ut his nullatenus praesumatis abuti. . . ." Also found in Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1225, no. 28.

[56] Tunis had been a center and entrepôt for Christian merchants over a considerable period. Already in the middle of the twelfth century the Pisans enjoyed numerous trade privileges and had a *fondaco* there. Cf. Adolf Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (München und Berlin, 1906), p. 278. Shortly thereafter, in 1161,

the incoming friars, these resident Christians, to safeguard their own lives and merchandise, compelled Brother Giles and his companions to board a ship docked in the harbor, possibly the one on which they had come. Furthermore, they forbade them to talk with or approach any Saracen.[57] Nevertheless, "contra voluntatem et prohibitionem Christianorum" the friars preached to the Saracens from shipboard. Finally, Brother Giles and his fellow Franciscans left, persuaded that they could not fulfill their task because of the hindrance of the resident Christians, "Christianis impedientibus illud."

At Ceuta, in 1227, the seven friars encountered the same difficulties. It is true that the Christians there, this time definitely merchants, made no effort to restrict them or to drive them out, but another circumstance held weight. At Ceuta no Christian was allowed in the city proper without a special permit of the Saracen officials, and that prohibition applied to all Christians, both merchants and missionaries. So the friars prepared to steal into the city before this fact could be discovered, so that they would not be hindered and stopped in their

---

the Genoese obtained even greater trade concessions that were valid in all of Northwest Africa. *Ibid.*, pp. 280ff. On the Genoese-Tunisian relations cf. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 285ff., 290-292 and the writer's study, "Genoese Trade with Northwest Africa in the Twelfth Century," in *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 380-383. In 1223 the Genoese received rights to a *fondaco*, oven and bath, which they had temporarily lost. The Pisans obtained less generous terms in a treaty of 1185 which remained in force for twenty-five years. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, p. 294. On Pisan-Tunisian relations, *ibid.*, pp. 292-301. In the reign of Frederick II the Sicilians also carried on an active trade; *ibid.*, pp. 301-304. On the Venetian-Tunisian relations, *ibid.*, pp. 305-307. At times French merchants also frequented the port of Tunis; *ibid.*, pp. 307-309.

[57] *AF*, III, 78: "Christiani, qui ibi aderant, apud quos frater Aegiduus cum aliis fratribus morabatur, ex hoc mori timentes, ipsos fratres illo sero navem reintrare fecerunt violenter, nec eos cum Saracenis loqui vel ad ipsos accedere permiserunt." The "navem reintrare" permits the conclusion that they might have come on the same ship, but does not demand it. A cargo ship would remain in a large port for several weeks, before it went on to the next destination. This narrative suggests that Brother Giles came to Tunis in the fall, so that the ship might have wintered in the Tunisian port for several months. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, I, *anno* 1219, no. 34, has the phrase "ita ut vitae et mercium dispendium immineret omnibus Christiani nominis ibidem commorantibus . . . illos ad naves compellerent."

preaching to the Moslems. However, the narrator was somewhat ambiguous in regard to the persons who would hinder them in their activities.[58] Certainly, the Saracens would have done so with legal right, but the Christians also would have done so to protect their status and privilege in the Christian quarter and the city proper. One can only surmise that in the greatest commercial port of Northwest Africa the Christian merchants would have been very zealous to protect their position.[59] In the first instance, the friars had to avoid detection by the Christians among whom they lived, so that their actions were taken with the Christians in mind. Furthermore, the chronicler reports that the brothers secretly made preparations for their venture, making confession to Brother Daniel and receiving the Holy Sacrament.[60] The secrecy took place among the Christians with whom they stayed. The fear about hindrance, then, was a fear of hindrance by the Christian merchants.

The three accounts of the earliest Franciscan missionary efforts in Northwest Africa show that the friars carried out very well the general hopes and the specified command of St. Francis. They worked primarily among the infidel Moslems, and they worked under the most challenging and difficult circumstances. But their experience proved that another approach was necessary, and the new method

[58] *AF*, III, 614: "Et ob hoc latenter volebant intrare, antequam perciperetur ab aliquo factum suum, ne impedirentur et sic non possent quae intendebant perficere, scilicet, inimicis Christi verbum Domini praedicare."

[59] Ceuta had always been a very favored port of the Genoese since the middle of the twelfth century. Cf. the present writer's "Genoese Trade with Northwest Africa," pp. 380-383. On Genoese trade with Ceuta in that century and in the early thirteenth century, cf. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 281, 287-290. Pisan relations were good, but less favorable than those of their rivals; *ibid.*, pp. 292-295. In contrast, the Marseillaise were in a very advantageous position; *ibid.*, pp. 307-310.

[60] *AF*, III, 614: "Feria igitur VI. de salute animae suae et aliorum secreto tractantes, die sabbati sequenti fratri Danieli sacramentalem confessionem facientes receperunt non minus devote Eucharistiae Sacramentum se Domino totaliter commendantes." Marcus of Lisbon, *Cronicken*, Book IV, ch. 30, suggests the fear of both Christians and Moslems. Van der Vat, *Franziskanermissionen*, p. 209, emphasizes the fear of the Christian merchants, but in note 34 of the same page refers to the prohibition against Christian entry into the city.

was enunciated by the over-all power of the Holy See, as represented at that time by Pope Honorius III. And yet, the efforts of the individual Franciscans and the more authoritative plans of the Holy See met with the same opposition. From the Moslems they naturally experienced an antipathy which Islam imposed upon its adherents in such a relationship. From the resident Christians, whose livelihood depended upon a friendly association with Moslems, they received an opposition that was based on mundane and materialistic factors; the chronicler expressed it well: "quia plus divitias quam Dei gloriam diligebant."

NOTE ON THE MERCHANTS' QUARTER AT CEUTA

In the narratives describing the activity and martyrdom of the seven friars at Ceuta in 1227, there occur several passages that refer to the foreign merchants' quarter just outside of the city walls. They are an important addition to the very sparse references to that arrangement at Ceuta.[61]

From Tarragona in Aragon the seven brothers sailed to Ceuta in two ships, one of them described as a *navis;* Brother Daniel and three companions departed first, the others followed several days later. The second group of friars followed the first group into Ceuta within three days, which suggests that shipping between the two cities was rather frequent.[62] The reason for the division was simply given:

[61] The other references have been to Christian *fondachi* and not to extensive quarters, with the possible exception of Subilia at Bougie. The Genoese annals of 1214 refer to a "scribania Septe," which demanded a sedentary notary, permanent records, and a place for their storage. *Annali Genovesi,* edited by L. Belgrano, in *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* (Rome, 1890), II, 132. In 1237 and 1239 Genoese consuls were stationed there, and their earlier presence is suggested. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte,* p. 290. According to a statute of 1228 Marseilles had extensive privileges in its *fondaco* in Ceuta, Bougie, Tunis and Oran. Louis Méry et F. Guindon, *Histoire analytique et chronologique des actes et des délibérations de la municipalité de Marseille,* 6 vols. (Marseilles, 1842-1848), I, 350ff.

[62] The Delorme version and Bartholomeus de Pisa say that the friars remained in the merchants' quarter for three days, but do not indicate that they had split into two groups. Delorme, "Pour l'histoire des martyrs du Maroc," p. 115; *AF,* IV, 296.

"quia ex casu non poterant omnes insimul transfretare" in the *Passio* account and "nauclerio renuente plures transvehere" in Wadding.[63] The refusal of the *nauclerius* to take all the friars was possibly due to lack of space on the ship, but very likely another reason connected with maritime law held weight. The *nauclerius* was the skilled mate of the ship, who had the technical direction of the ship and its crew; he was usually selected by the merchants who had leased cargo space on the ship.[64] In his position of responsibility to the merchants as well as to the crew he not only had to follow maritime custom and law, but he had to carry out the provisions of the specific contract which limited the number of extra passengers that could be carried on any trip.[65] In the case of the friars the quota of extra passengers may have been reached.

All accounts say that the friars remained with the Christian merchants in a special quarter assigned to them and located just outside of the city walls. This special quarter was assigned to them because they were not allowed in the city proper except with special permission of the local authorities.[66] This arrangement was made in the interest of amicable relations between Christians and Moslems. Under the

[63] *AF*, III, 613; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221, no. 36.

[64] Eugene H. Byrne, *Genoese Shipping in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 36ff.

[65] In a lease of a ship for a voyage to Tunis, made in 1251, the owners of the ship "promittunt non habere in dicta navi ultra peregrinos 100, inter quos non sit aliqua femina." Mas Latrie, *Traités de paix et de commerce, Documents*, p. 122.

[66] *AF*, III, 614: "Morabantur autem sancti fratres cum aliis mercatoribus christianis in quodam vico extra moenia civitatis praedictae, quia nulli Christiano licitum erat ingredi civitaten sine Saracenorum licentia speciali;" Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221, no. 36: "Morabantur pauperes Fratres cum reliquis, qui aderant, Christianis, mercatoribus in vico extra moenia praedictae civitatis (quia nulli Christianorum licebat eamden ingredi absque Saracenorum speciali facultate) . . .;" *AF*, IV, 296: ". . . manserunt tribus diebus in vico, qui erat extra civitatem concessus christianis mercatoribus et deputatus;" *AF*, II, 44: "Hi . . . venerunt Septam, civitatem Marochiorum, ubi foris muros mercatoribus diebus aliquot praedicaverunt, quia intrare urbem nulli licitum erat Christiano;" Delorme, "Pour l'histoire des martyrs du Maroc," p. 115: ". . . manserunt tribus diebus in vico, qui erat civitatem christianis mercatoribus deputatus."

arrangement the Christians would have less occasion to desecrate a Moslem holy day or religious rite, inadvertently or otherwise, and fanatical Moslems would have less opportunity to attack the Christians and their propertry.[67] Permission to enter an ordinary Moslem city and to travel through Moslem lands was readily given, and this permission included a guarantee of safety and security. Without it the Christians were open to attack, robbery, and murder. Merchants had no difficulty in obtaining such grants, while missionaries obviously encountered serious objections and refusals. To the latter permission was only granted upon the promise that they would work among the resident Christians and not attempt to proselytize the Moslems.[68] The separate quarter which gave a semblance of permanent residence and secure storage was of considerable advantage to those Christian merchants who dealt continuously in a commercial center. The Moslems who gained an advantage from that Christian commerce were anxious to facilitate the exchange and did so by providing special quarters for the Christians. At one time, it is true, the Christians wrung those concessions from the Moslem leaders, but by the early thirteenth century relations were already on a much better business basis. The name of the quarter is given in the *Passio* as "Alfondagia, id est vico Ianuensium, Marsiliensium et Pisanorum," and in Wadding as "Alfondega (quam Rodulphus villam seu vicum putat, verius dixisset reconditorium mercium venalium)," and in the Delorme version simply as "Alfondegha Marsiliensium." Certainly *Alfondagia* and related terms are merely latinized forms of *al-funduk,* the Arabic term for *fondaco,* originally an inn for lodging, but then also a warehouse for the storage of goods and eventually also a quarter in which foreign merchants resided, stored, and exchanged their wares.[69] At Ceuta the Moslems apparently had granted to all of the Christian merchants a general quarter outside of the city

[67] In the Marseilles *fondaco* no pigs were to be kept to avoid giving offence to the Moslems.

[68] Heffening, *Das islamische Fremdenrecht,* pp. 9, 45.

[69] William Heyd, "Über Funda und Fondaco," in *Sitzungsberichte der k. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Classe* (Jahrgang, 1880), pp. 617-627.

walls; to it no single communal group had exclusive rights. Within that quarter each communal group may have had its special street or fondaco in the narrow sense. In other centers of Northwest Africa the Christian communes established such separate fondachi for themselves. At Tunis the Pisans and Genoese had their separate fondachi, with a wall between them; and entry to the other's fondaco was prohibited to each communal group. Similar conditions seemed to prevail in other centers like Bona, El-Mehdia, Bougie, Gabes, Sfax, and Tripoli.[70]

Our accounts give little information beyond that which would naturally appear in hagiographic material. The area had a Christian cemetery or, at least, a burial ground, in which the seven martyrs were honorably buried.[71] Nothing was mentioned about the usual bath and oven, but the narratives demanded no mention of these. It seems, too, that each of three communal groups had its own priest or priests, possibly its own church, although it is very possible that the three groups used the same church for their services. The Genoese certainly had more than one resident priest, since one of them was described as "domino Hugoni, maiori sacerdoti Ianuensium."[72] Only Wadding made a reference of another sort, and that was made parenthetically; he described the quarter as a "reconditorium mercium venalium." A Marseilles statute of 1228 indicates that the Marseillaise quarter, at least, was of considerable importance. In the statute, which dealt primarily with the importation and sale of Marseilles wine, the commune provided quarters and lodging for a *fundacarius* and his secretary; the *fundacarius* was allowed to rent out, for one year only, shops to a tailor, cordwainer, and two furriers; one shop was set aside for the sale of wine.[73]

HILMAR C. KRUEGER

University of Cincinnati

[70] Mas Latrie, *Traités de paix et de commerce, Documents*, pp. 32ff., 43ff., 118.

[71] *AF*, III, 616; II, 45; IV, 297.

[72] *AF*, III, 614; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, II, *anno* 1221, no. 39.

[73] Méry et Guindon, *Histoire . . . de Marseille*, I, 350-352.

CAHENSLYISM: THE SECOND CHAPTER, 1891-1910

Cahenslyism, described as the "demand for a greater degree of eccclesiastical autonomy by foreign language groups within the American Church," was the subject of an article in the last volume of this REVIEW.[1] That article was admittedly a preliminary survey of readily available materials concerning the early phases of a controversy that eventually caused much discussion and ill-feeling among the members of the American Catholic hierarchy, priesthood, and laity. The problem first presented itself as an administrative question. The bishops of the American Church, although not in complete agreement as to the proper methods of exercising jurisdiction over the various national groups which made up the Catholic population of the United States, resented in common what appeared to be a European attempt to dictate their domestic administrative procedures. The fears of the American hierarchy seemed to have been calmed by papal assurances in June, 1891, that Rome had no intention of interfering with the internal administration of the American Church relative to the choice of episcopal candidates.[2] Appearances were deceptive. Cahenslyism shortly became a more divisive question than ever before. This was due to a variety of complicating circumstances, including a doctrinal controversy over the alleged heretical character of certain American religious practices, and a political controversy involving Church-State relationships on the school question.

It is impossible to do more here than outline the general development of the problem after 1891, to demonstrate its relationship to other ecclesiastical questions of the period, and to indicate sources in which church historians may discover materials of value for preparation of the definitive story of the controversy.[3]

[1] John J. Meng, "Cahenslyism: The First Stage, 1883-1891," XXXI (January, 1946), 389-413.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 408.

[3] The materials for this article are drawn largely from the New York Archdiocesan Archives (referred to herein as NYAA) and the Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA). Other valuable sources of information on Cahenslyism must

Cahensly's first visit to the United States, in 1883, provided the arbitrarily-selected date for beginning a discussion of the problem. He came to this country with the good wishes and blessings of Giovanni Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Congregation of the Propaganda.[4] The question of nationalism in the American Church had already been agitated by John Gilmary Shea in the pages of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, and by the editors of the *Pastoral-Blatt*, German-language newspaper of St. Louis.[5] The latter had undertaken to answer Shea's charge that nationalism was a threat to the life of the Church in the United States. The following year, 1884, saw an intensification of the conflict. Eighty-two St. Louis German priests, with the approval of their vicar-general, the Very Reverend Henry Muehlsiepen, submitted a petition to Propaganda requesting correc-

---

be consulted before a definitive history of the controversy can be written. First among these are the Library and Archives of the Central Bureau of the Catholic Central Verein of America, in St. Louis. The Roman correspondence of Monsignor Denis J. O'Connell, in the archives of the Diocese of Richmond, would doubtless throw much light on the question, as would also the diocesan archives of Limburg am Lahn, and the Prussian State Archives. The archives of the Congregation of the Propaganda in Rome would unquestionably be a further source of valuable data. The archives of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati and the Diocese of Cleveland likewise contain valuable material. References to Cahenslyism probably exist in the archives of every American diocese existing at the time of the agitation. Unfortunate circumstances have conspired to deprive historians of certain obvious leads. The headquarters, library, and archives of the St.-Raphaels Verein in Hamburg, containing a comprehensive collection on Cahensly and his activities, were totally destroyed by bombs during World War II. Cahensly's extensive personal correspondence was destroyed by his relatives after his death. The late Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee is said to have collected all the material he could find on Cahenslyism. These materials, if they existed, seem to have been lost. They have not been located in the Milwaukee archives, nor in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives where they were reported to have been deposited. The papers of Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul were burned before that prelate's death in 1918. Leo House, in New York City, the American headquarters of the St.-Raphaels Verein, possesses no archives. The private papers of its director during the crucial years of Cahenslyism have been destroyed. The comprehensive archival collections of the University of Notre Dame contain nothing of value on Cahenslyism.

[4] NYAA, I-41, Simeoni to M. A. Corrigan, Rome, July 17, 1883, in Italian.

[5] Cf. Meng, *op. cit.*, p. 393 n.

tion of what they considered inequities in the administration of their diocese. The author of this letter was P. M. Abbelen, a priest of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.[6] They sought autonomous privileges for their German-speaking congregations.[7] Propaganda looked into the matter by referring it to the consideration of James Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore,[8] who thought the complaint "at least exaggerated."[9] The whole subject of the relationship between foreign-language parishes and English-speaking parishes was deferred for the time being, a treatment which did not meet with the approval of the Germans.[10] Propaganda was inclined to give some weight to their objections. In December, 1885, Cardinal Simeoni again wrote Gibbons, asking the Baltimore cardinal for his opinion on the advisability of maintaining independent foreign-language churches.[11] Cardinal Gibbons replied that he saw no difficulty in doing so. He did stress, however, the difficulty of holding children of immigrants to membership in the foreign-language parishes as they became accustomed to the English language and American ways of life.[12]

The petition of 1884 did not result in any change in the status of the St. Louis German churches. The next move on the part of the

[6] NYAA, C-2, Gibbons to Corrigan, Baltimore, February 6, 1885.

[7] This petition was dated July 31, 1884. It was later printed in *Relatio de quaestione Germanica in Statibus Foederatis a Rev. P. M. Abbelen* . . . (Milwaukee, n.d.), p. 73.

[8] BCA, 78-Q-4, Simeoni to Gibbons, Rome, October 2, 1884, in Latin.

[9] Gibbons to Corrigan, Baltimore, October 21, 1884 (NYAA, C-2); *id.* to Simeoni, Baltimore, October 23, 1884, in Latin (BCA, Copybook of James Gibbons, pp. 127-129.) Cf. also: Muehlsiepen to Gibbons, St. Louis, October 20, 1884 (BCA, 78-R-18); Archbishop P. J. Ryan to Gibbons, Philadelphia, October 22, 1884 (BCA, 78-S-3); Gibbons to Muehlsiepen, Baltimore, October 24, 1884 (BCA, Copybook of James Gibbons, p. 130); Gibbons to Simeoni, Baltimore, November 27, 1884, in Latin (BCA, Copybook of James Gibbons, p. 137).

[10] Cf. BCA, 79-O-11, Bishop John Moore to Gibbons, St. Augustine, Florida, July 15, 1885.

[11] BCA, 79-W-10, Rome, December 15, in Latin. Roman sympathy with the Germans was reflected in comments contained in a letter (BCA, 79-T-20), from Ella B. Edes to Gibbons, Rome, October 24, 1885.

[12] BCA, Copybook of James Gibbons, Baltimore [January, 1886?], in Latin, 164-167.

German-American priests was to send to Propaganda a second and more detailed plea for greater rights. This petition, with the consent of Archbishop Michael Heiss of Milwaukee, and of Cardinal Simeoni, was taken to Rome by Father Abbelen, its author, the man who had also penned the first petition. Before leaving America, Abbelen wrote Cardinal Gibbons at length concerning his mission, and requested a note of introduction to Cardinal Simeoni.[13] Gibbons complied with the request for a letter, an action for which he was later chided by Bishop John J. Keane of Richmond.[14] The archives of New York and Baltimore contain numerous items further documenting the storm of protest aroused by Abbelen's petition.[15] Propaganda

[13] BCA, 82-B-1, Milwaukee, October 4, 1886. In view of this letter it is difficult to credit the charges of "secrecy" which were subsequently levelled against Abbelen and Heiss.

[14] Cf. Abbelen's acknowledgment of Gibbons' letter, BCA, 82-E-13, Rome, November 15, 1886. Keane wrote Gibbons from Rome on December 4: ". . . we are informed that this secret emissary [Abbelen] of a clique of German Bishops among us, comes to the Holy See with a letter of commendation from your Eminence! No wonder the Propaganda is puzzled!" BCA, 82-G-4.

[15] On December 9, 1886, Gibbons sent Corrigan the text of an urgent cablegram from Bishops Keane and Ireland in Rome asking for immediate support for their protest against the Abbelen petition (NYAA, C-15). This was acknowledged by Corrigan from New London, Connecticut, on December 11. The New York prelate suggested a meeting of the Archbishops of Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore to draft a protest to Rome (BCA, 82-H-1). Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland, on December 10, pleaded with Bishop Moore of St. Augustine to persuade Gibbons to support a protest against the Abbelen memorial (BCA, 82-G-8). Moore complied by sending Gilmour's letter to Gibbons on December 19, together with his own arguments along the same line (BCA, 82-H-6). Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia feared a conflict of nationalities within the Church, and hoped for firm action by the hierarchy to prevent it (to Gibbons, Philadelphia, December 10, BCA, 82-G-10). The meeting of archbishops suggested by Corrigan was held at Philadelphia on December 16. Corrigan drafted a letter to Cardinal Simeoni in the name of the four American prelates, and sent it off to Rome the following day. A copy of the letter went to Gibbons in Baltimore (BCA, 82-H-5). Archbishop William Henry Elder of Cincinnati acknowledged on December 20 a letter from Cardinal Gibbons dated December 17. Evidently the cardinal had suggested sending a protest against the Abbelen petition to the German-American bishops whom he considered responsible for it. Elder thought it advisable to defer such action, although he believed "that some time, and in some form, they should be made

deferred consideration of the memorial to its meeting of April 11, 1887, when it rejected most of the German claims.[16] This rejection was not accepted as final by the German-Americans. Father Abbelen wrote Cardinal Gibbons on June 30, 1887:

> Your Eminence's letter [of June 26] contains for me the first intimation of a decision by the H. See, and that, one in the negative, or, at least, of delay. In the very nature of things this decision will not have been considered—I mean by the H. See itself—as final. This my view of the decision will, however, not induce me to enter into any unbecoming, passionate agitation of the matter.[17]

In Cleveland, Bishop Gilmour gloated. "Deo Gratias!" he wrote Gibbons, "The struggle is over for the time and for a while we will have rest on this German assumption, but believe me the end is not yet."[18] Two years later Archbishop Corrigan wrote an interesting

---

aware of how unfair has been their conduct in this matter" (BCA, 82-H-9). Later, December 30, after he had read the text of the Abbelen petition, Elder again wrote Gibbons: "While I strongly deprecate this secret method of dealing, yet if the facts are as stated, I would favor some measures being taken, not for 'special legislation' by Rome, but to *hinder special* legislation in *dioceses*, I think the German pastors and German congregations should not be put on inequality with others" (BCA, 82-J-6). Bishop Gilmour wrote Gibbons a lengthy tirade against the Germans, claiming that unless "the Archbishops cry halt and ask Rome to wait till the Bishops in America can be, and collegialiter are heard, . . . in twenty-five years it will be too late and the Church in the Mississippi valley will be bound hand and foot to the wheel of Germanism" (NYAA, E, g, Cleveland, December 20, BCA, 82-H-10). Gilmour wrote in similar vein to Corrigan. Bishop Camillus P. Maes of Covington also wrote Gibbons protesting against the German claims (NYAA, C-15, Gibbons to Corrigan, Baltimore, December 21). Bishops Ireland and Keane in Rome were the direct instigators of this campaign of protest against the Abbelen petition, as was evidenced by a letter from Monsignor Denis J. O'Connell, Rector of the North American College, to Gibbons, Rome, December 10 (BCA, 82-G-9).

[16] Cf. BCA, 82-P-12, Corrigan to Gibbons, New York, April 12, 1887. The printed text of Propaganda's decisions was sent by Simeoni to Gibbons on June 8 (BCA, 82-S-5/1). This copy contained a printer's error which caused some discussion, and was explained in an exchange of letters between Cardinal Gibbons and Bede Maler, O.S.B., of St. Louis (BCA, 83-F-8; 83-G-10, 11). Cf. also BCA, 83-K-5, D. J. O'Connell to Gibbons, Rome, September 4, 1887.

[17] BCA, 82-W-8, Milwaukee.

[18] BCA, 83-C-6, July 16, 1887.

account of the whole question to an unnamed correspondent, evidently a member of the hierarchy, in which he mentioned difficulties with Canadians and Italians similar to those that had arisen with the Germans.[19] Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, was made aware of some of the Church's nationality problems in 1888. He wrote Cardinal Gibbons on January 20: "As a specimen of the queer letters I receive I enclose one handed to me this morning by a young man from Buffalo."[20] The "queer" letter was a communication in faulty English from the Reverend Ignatius Barszcz, "Rector of the Polish Church in Jersey City, N. Y. [*sic*]," asking Cleveland to write to the Pope and to Cardinals Czacki and Simeoni in support of Barszcz's petition for the appointment of a Polish bishop to exercise jurisdiction over all Poles in the United States.[21] Father Barszcz had interviewed the cardinal on the subject on January 3, and had left with him a printed copy of a letter evidently addressed to Cardinal Simeoni on October 29, 1887. On this copy Gibbons wrote: "The favor asked should not be granted. I so informed the writer."[22] For President Cleveland the cardinal drafted a note to be used by the White House in acknowledging Barszcz's letter. It mentioned that "the Cardinal of Balto. . . . did not look with favor on the petition presented to Mr. Cleveland."[23]

Reading between the lines of much of the correspondence of the American bishops during this period and the years following, it is evident that one of the divisive factors in the situation was competition for episcopal honors. Symptomatic of this competition was a revealing passage in a letter of Bishop Gilmour to Cardinal Gibbons:

[19] NYAA, C-39, carbon copy of unaddressed typed letter, March 29, 1889.

[20] BCA, 84-A-7.

[21] BCA, 84-A-6.

[22] BCA, 83-P-4.

[23] BCA, 84-B-7. No attempt is made in this article to discuss the national ambitions of other American Catholic groups. The above instance is an illustration of the type of technique used more than once by nationalistically-impelled Catholics. Poles, Italians, Canadians, and other immigrant nationalities agitated for special favors at one time or another. Occasionally their importunities were touched upon during the discussions centering around Cahensly.

Please note, in our province, the three last bishops appointed were each the *"dignus,"* the dignissimi and digniores being in each case Irish. The digni German, or in Covington German sympathizer, and this done by *secret* work and now in Belleville a repetition, soon to be followed. I take in Alton in the same line. Not a single Irishman in all the Province of Cinti. with its *ten* bishops. Better not drive the Irish too far and it would be well to impress this on Rome, and on America also.[24]

Monsignor O'Connell, vacationing at Grottaferrata, reported to Gibbons on July 31, 1887, that "the agitation of the German question did not help the last episcopal nominations. There were four lists with Germans on every one of them save one and no German was chosen."[25] An interview with Archbishop Heiss, published in the Milwaukee *Sentinel* of August 18, 1887, admitted that the need for more German bishops would probably be discussed at the meeting of the German Roman Catholic Central Society, scheduled for Chicago on September 4.[26] Archbishop William H. Gross of Portland, Oregon, complained to Gibbons of the unfortunate impression created by this interview: "Archbp. Heiss makes every bishop and archbishop in the United States to be an Englishman, Frenchman, Irishman, German or Belgian —there is not an American among us." Such an attitude, asserted Gross, would help convince Americans at large of the essentially foreign character of the Church, a most unfortunate result.[27] Somewhat the same fears were expressed by Elder of Cincinnati. He wrote to Gibbons on September 2 concerning the "serious injury to discipline and to authority" done by Heiss in "communicating church questions and grievances to the public papers." Elder added a further note touching on the question of episcopal selection. He feared a "powerful" attempt "to get a German for Detroit." The diocesan clergy, he pointed out, "have agreed unanimously on Dr. Foley, their very first proposal. . . . Now if this is set aside, under indirect influence of other parties, what confidence can the priests have that there is any *earnest-*

[24] BCA, 82-H-10, Cleveland, December 20, 1886. Gilmour was born in Scotland.

[25] BCA, 83-D-12.

[26] BCA, 82-H-2/1.

[27] BCA, 83-J-6, Portland, August 30, 1887.

ness in the movement to elevate them? Please write for Dr. Foley."[28]

Ecclesiastical nationalism assumed the appearance of a German-Irish competition for episcopal place and privilege, although clearly its motivation was not solely personal ambition. Various members of the hierarchy and clergy were sincerely convinced that the future of the American Church and the welfare of souls were intimately involved in the matter. The German-Americans insisted with honest conviction and a great deal of logic that thousands of Catholic immigrants would be lost to the faith unless their religious needs were cared for by prelates and priests who knew their language and their customs. It was on the basis of this need that the Cahensly memorials of 1891 appealed to the Holy See for the appointment of "national" bishops in the United States. On the other side was a group that emphasized "Americanization" as the only satisfactory way to effect peaceable integration of the Church into the American milieu.

Rome maintained an attitude of official neutrality,[29] although Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul believed that potent German political forces were successfully bringing pressure to bear on the Vatican in support of the German demands.[30] The Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, sent official notification to Cardinal Gibbons on June 28, 1891, that the Holy See had no intention of acceding to the requests of the St.-Raphaels Verein and Cahensly for the appointment of "national" bishops in the United States.[31] Rampolla advised that it

[28] BCA, 83-K-1, Cincinnati. The Reverend John S. Foley of Baltimore subsequently became Bishop of Detroit in 1888.

[29] O'Connell reported to Gibbons from Rome, on January 17, 1891, the words of Cardinal Rampolla, Papal Secretary of State: "Unfortunately there are two parties in the United States and the Holy See cannot favor either of them, it must stand between" (BCA, 88-H-2).

[30] Cf. his letter to Gibbons, St. Paul, July 2, 1891, printed in Daniel F. Reilly, *The School Controversy (1891-1893)* (Washington, 1943), pp. 70-71; cf. also BCA, 88-U-2, O'Connell to Gibbons, Rome, August 3, 1891.

[31] BCA, 88-R-9, Rome. An English translation of the Italian text was printed by almost all the Catholic newspapers of the time. Documentary sources on the Roman and American reaction to the Cahensly memorials are abundant. Cf. Bishop John Foley (Detroit) to Gibbons, June 2, 1891, in which he spoke of "the wicked wretch, Cahensly, who is striving to undo the work of the Church

would be well for the American hierarchy to hold no special meeting on the subject, but to let the controversy die out of its own accord. This suggestion was bolstered by a personal letter from Denis O'Connell in which he told Cardinal Gibbons of an audience with the Pope on June 30. Leo XIII said that he had instructed Rampolla to tell Gibbons that the request for "national" bishops would not be granted. O'Connell felt also that, in view of the Pope's attitude, it would be advisable to take no further official notice of the Cahensly proposals until the regular annual meeting of the American archbishops, which was scheduled for St. Louis the following November.[32] Gibbons accordingly included in his acknowledgment of Rampolla's letter an assurance that the American hierarchy would carry the matter no further, but would be content to rely on the decision of the Holy See.[33]

---

in our Country" (BCA, 88-Q-1). Gibbons unburdened himself to Elder of Cincinnati on June 3, when he wrote concerning a meeting to nominate a successor to Gilmour as Bishop of Cleveland: "I regard your meeting as exceedingly important, as being the first that will take place, since the revelation of the Americo-European conspiracy, which has inflicted so deep an insult on the Episcopate and the Catholics of the United States and seems to regard the sees of America as fit to be filled by the first greedy ecclesiastical adventurer that comes to our country" (BCA, 88-Q-2). On the same day, June 3, Ryan of Philadelphia wrote to Gibbons of his opposition to the Cahensly proposals (BCA, 88-Q-3). Archbishop-elect Katzer of Milwaukee, credited by John Ireland with being the author of the "conspiracy," wrote the Baltimore cardinal on June 5 of "this deplorable Cahensly affair, of which I knew absolutely nothing" (BCA, 88-Q-4). Cf. also Simeoni to Corrigan, Rome, June 27, in Italian (NYAA, I-42). Gross of Oregon besought Gibbons on June 28 "to devise some means to destroy utterly the horrible move initiated by Herr Cahensly and the Lucerne Conference. . . . That disgusting and diabolical nationalism hatched in Milwaukee has already done grievous mischief" (BCA, 88-R-8). Monsignor Bernard O'Reilly suggested that he go to Rome to "expose the misrepresentations and misstatements of the mischief makers" (to Gibbons, New York, July 2, BCA, 88-S-2). Cf. also: Gibbons to Corrigan, Cape May, New Jersey, July 11 (NYAA, C-15); Corrigan's reply, New York, July 13 (BCA, 88-T-1); Gibbons to Corrigan, Cape May, July 14 (NYAA, C-15); *id* to *id.*, Baltimore, July 16 (NYAA, C-15); Archbishop Francis Janssens of New Orleans to Gibbons, Ponchatoula, Louisiana, July 24, approving the action of the Holy See (BCA, 88-T-4).

[32] BCA, 88-S-1, Rome, July 1, 1891. Cf. also, BCA, 88-S-9, Gibbons to O'Connell, Cape May, New Jersey, July 12, 1891.

[33] BCA, 88-T-7, Baltimore, July 29, 1891, in Italian.

In this manner the controversy seemed to have run its course. Cardinal Gibbons' sermon at the investiture of Archbishop Katzer on August 20, 1891, constituted a plea for unity among the members of the hierarchy. It was given wide publicity in the columns of Catholic newspapers and, together with Cardinal Rampolla's letter, which had also been published, seemed to promise an end to the matter.[34]

Once more appearances were misleading. Monsignor O'Connell wrote Gibbons from Rome in a way that demonstrated the probability of still further agitation for the appointment of "national" bishops. O'Connell had talked with Cardinal Rampolla, the Secretary of State. The cardinal "said there was no need of any further agita-

I added: then, your Eminence, when Von Schloezer, Cahensly and Volpi-Landi come to you again to treat of affairs of the Church in America, please don't give them a hearing, for see all the agitation it has created. That, he replied, the Holy See cannot do, when these men come to us and request us to look after the interests of their *Connazionali* that they say are losing their faith in America we are bound to hear them. And sometimes men of great merit interpose their influence, for instance Windhorst was deeply interested in this plan. I said "That, your Eminence, is precisely what offends public sentiment in America, that these people coming to America still consider themselves under the control of the government of Prussia. Oh but, said he, the Holy See can take no account of feelings of that kind; the Holy See must look equally after all without taking any account of nationality.

O'Connell remarked further on in his letter: "The more I see of it: the more convinced I am that this question which is a purely spiritual one for us is a political one for them and that it forms part of their policy in dealing with the central Powers. Nothing will ever restrain them in America, but the voice of the civil power."[35] By "them," O'Connell apparently meant the Papal Secretary of State, Rampolla, and Cardinal Persico, Secretary of the Congregation of the Propaganda.

[34] Cf. Meng, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-412.

[35] BCA, 88-U-2, August 3, 1891. Reverend John P. Farrelly, later Bishop of Cleveland, also wrote Gibbons from Grottaferrata in the same vein: "It appears that the eagerness to please C[ahensly]'s powerful abettors was such that his plan was never regarded with disfavor. A government makes a good backer" (August 14, 1891, BCA, 88-U-4).

The Catholic press heralded the conclusion of the controversy. Those journals which had been critical of the Cahensly memorials printed Rampolla's letter to Gibbons with evident glee, accompanied by comments on Cahensly freely interlarded with the words "conspiracy" and "plot."[36]

The fifth German-American Catholic Congress convened at Buffalo, New York, between September 21 and 24, 1891. Bishop Stephen V. Ryan of Buffalo found the meeting not to his liking, but his objections were more general than specific.[37] Cahenslyism seemed dead and buried. The only bit of friction occurred when the Reverend George Zurcher, a Germanophobe and temperance reformer, made his way uninvited into the first closed session of the Priester-Verein, held in conjunction with the congress. He was asked to leave, but not before hearing an assurance "that the verein was not working to secure German bishops in the United States, and that it was not opposed to temperance."[38]

By this time the attention of the American hierarchy was largely concentrated on the school question. Since 1890 Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul had taken the lead in demanding a revision of relations between Church and State with regard to the establishment and maintenance of compulsory education in the primary school grades. Ireland, firm in his belief that the Church needed "Americanization," had highly praised the public school system of the United States, and had regretted the necessity of maintaining separate parochial schools for Catholic children. In his own words: "I deplored the necessity of Catholics being obliged after paying in tax for the support of State schools to maintain again by voluntary contributions schools of their

[36] Cf. *Catholic Review*, XL (August 22, 1891), 113, 121; *ibid.*, August 29, 1891, 130; *ibid.*, September 12, 1891, 162; *The Tablet* (London), LXXVIII (August 22, 1891), 303.

[37] BCA, 89-A-1, Ryan to Gibbons, Buffalo, October 6, 1891.

[38] *Catholic Review*, XL (October 10, 1891), 226. Cf. also *ibid.*, October 3, 1891, 217. The proceedings of the congress were published under the title *Verhandlungen der fünften allgemeinen Versammlung der Katholiken deutscher Zunge der Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika in Buffalo, N. Y. am 21., 22., 23. und 24. September 1891* (Buffalo, 1891).

own, and asked the State for means to maintain Catholic schools as well as Protestant, or if it would not grant us that, which we thought was our due, to permit us to introduce the teaching of religion into the schools of the State."[39] Ireland had presented the same arguments to the National Educational Association in July, 1890, in somewhat sharper terms. He had referred to the state system of public schools as "our pride and glory." He had expressed "regret that there is a necessity" for the existence of the parochial school.[40] These arguments were not understood by many Catholics. A number of German-American prelates, particularly Archbishop Katzer of Milwaukee, were offended by them. Ireland believed that opposition to the kind of educational development he advocated was closely linked to the purposes of the "Cahensly conspiracy." He was convinced that the Germans fought all attempts to modify or eliminate the parochial schools because they wished to use these schools for the perpetuation of the German language, German customs, and German loyalty. On the school question the Archbishop of St. Paul found support in the firm approval of Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Keane, and Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria. Steps were taken in Rome during the early stages of the controversy to secure an explanation of Ireland's educational ideas. He was vindicated there, largely through the good offices of Cardinal Gibbons. Scant attention was paid the school problem by the Catholic press during its earlier phases. By the summer of 1891, both Cahenslyism and the school controversy seemed to have been definitively settled to the satisfaction of Ireland and Gibbons.[41]

The school question was not dead, nor was Cahenslyism. Both were revived during the late summer and early fall of 1891. This time the issues involved were less clear than they had been during the earlier period of agitation over the Cahensly memorials. Central

[39] Reilly, *School Controversy*, p. 53.

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

[41] For the details, cf. Reilly, *School Controversy, passim.* A good summary account of the problem is in Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton, and Edward T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston* . . . (New York, 1944), III, 172-182.

to the situation was a conflict between two groups of prelates in the American hierarchy. On the one hand were the so-called "liberals" led by Gibbons and Ireland. They believed that the Church in the United States should be "Americanized." "We must be in harmony with our political institutions," said Gibbons in his sermon at Katzer's investiture. Harmonizing the practices of Roman Catholicism and American Protestantism was at best a delicate operation. No member of the "liberal" group advocated departure from the dogmatic teachings of the Church in matters of faith and morals. They desired only such compromise on the externals of Catholic conduct as would evidence to their American compatriots the loyal American character of the Catholic community.[42]

Opposing them were the "conservatives" who feared lest compromise on externals end in heresy. This group believed that the parochial school was the bulwark of Catholic faith. They fought all attempts to amalgamate Catholic and state primary education. Similarly they objected to various other adaptations of Catholic practice to American institutions which seemed to them liable to compromise the integrity of Catholic doctrine.[43]

The conflict attracted the attention of Rome, which is always alert to detect any threat to the seamless fabric of the faith. In time, largely because of the misinterpretation of certain American Catholic religious practices by a group of French intellectuals, the charge of American heresy was brought to Rome. When that happened the Holy Father, Leo XIII, condemned the practices in question, but accepted the assurances of the American "liberals" that they were neither utilized nor encouraged in the United States.[44]

In this conflict that went deep into the roots of American Catholicism, Cahenslyism was little more than a confusing complication. The

[42] "The more liberal group may, perhaps, be described as the party of bolder action and new methods," Lord-Sexton-Harrington, *op. cit.*, III, 162.

[43] "To conservatives it appeared that the goal was better to be reached by not forcing the pace, but by trusting to slower, more cautious, more time-honored methods." *Ibid.*, III, 163.

[44] On this complicated subject cf: Thomas T. McAvoy, "Americanism and Frontier Catholicism," *Review of Politics*, V (July, 1943), 275-301; "Ameri-

original outburst of American indignation against the so-called "conspiracy" was set off by the petitions of Europeans. Opposition to the foreign proposals was spontaneous and well-nigh unanimous among those members of the American hierarchy who were non-German in their antecedents. Even some who belonged to the latter group united with the majority in condemning European interference with the internal administration of the American Church. The bishops might differ sharply among themselves with regard to measures of internal control and administration, but they agreed in resenting extra-official foreign attempts to regulate procedures which they alone were competent to manage.

The resuscitation of Cahenslyism after 1891 proceeded from much different causes. No longer did it occupy the center of the stage as a clear-cut American-versus-foreign jurisdictional dispute. Instead, it became one of the weapons in the struggle over "Americanization" of the Church in this country. The proponents of "Americanization" viewed Cahenslyism as the keystone of a plot to prevent "Americanization" of the Church and to Germanize the United States. Cahensly's apologists considered it nothing more than a pious, philanthropic movement to better the material condition and improve the spiritual welfare of Catholic immigrants to the United States. They thought the charges of their opponents were deliberately malicious perversions of the truth designed to draw the attention of American Catholics away from the pernicious aspects of "Americanization" by turning attention upon Cahensly as a convenient scapegoat. Words of the harshest sort were used by both camps. Some members of the hierarchy who had opposed Cahenslyism when it was a clear and comparatively uncomplicated issue before 1891, found themselves allied with its supporters because of the larger questions involved after that date.

---

canism, Fact and Fiction," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXI (July, 1945), 133-153; Vincent F. Holden, "A Myth in 'L'Américanisme'," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXI (July, 1945), 154-170; John J. Meng, "A Century of American Catholicism As Seen Through French Eyes," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVII (April, 1941), 39-68.

The signal for a revival of conflict among the members of the hierarchy was given by Archbishop Ireland in August, 1891. The St. Paul prelate negotiated an agreement with the State of Minnesota permitting the school boards of Faribault and Stillwater to take over control of the two parochial schools in those localities. The terms of the transfer were not exceptional. Similar arrangements had existed in other states for a long time. Ireland's action aroused special comment and discussion because of his well-known views on the desirability of amalgamating Catholic and public primary education. The "Faribault Plan" was attacked by Protestants who saw in it a Catholic threat to control the public schools. It was loudly criticized by Catholics who feared that it meant the elimination of all parochial schools, first in Minnesota, then perhaps, elsewhere.[45]

The controversy aroused by Ireland's action seemed destined to be sharp and short. By November, 1891, it was dying out. Ireland was asked to explain the details of his school plan to the American archbishops at their second annual meeting, held in St. Louis on the twenty-ninth of that month. This he did without incurring the opposition of his colleagues.[46] Also on the agenda of the meeting was consideration of the Cahensly memorial. It was "discussed at length."

Two points in this petition were marked for special censure. 1. The exaggerated and unjustifiable statements as to the losses to the Church of foreign-born Catholics, owing to the neglect of their spiritual welfare by the bishops of the country. 2. The interference by subjects or governments of foreign countries in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs in America. The resolution was unanimously adopted that a letter be sent to the Holy See respectfully and firmly protesting against all such foreign interference in our affairs as we were threatened with in the Cahensly memorial, and also against the utterly false representations made in this and other documents to the effect that the losses to the faith in the United States had been during the century enormous in their magnitude.[47]

[45] For a brief but accurate account of Ireland's school experiment at Faribault and Stillwater, cf. William Watts Folwell, *A History of Minnesota* (St. Paul, 1921-1930), IV, 174-183.

[46] For Cardinal Gibbons' recollections of this discussion, cf. his letter to Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, BCA, 89-T-9, Baltimore, April 11, 1892.

[47] BCA, 89-D-5, from the official minutes of the meeting.

Ireland's explanation of the school plan may have satisfied the archbishops gathered at St. Louis, but its validity was soon called into question. Two pamphlets printed just before the St. Louis meeting threw the discussion wide open and prevented a seemly conclusion to the controversy. Dr. Thomas Bouquillon, professor of moral theology in the Catholic University of America, published a brochure entitled *Education: To Whom Does It Belong?* This was later described as a "purely abstract exposition of principles independent of circumstances of time and country."[48] The pamphlet upheld the right of the state to control education and make it compulsory. Ireland's opponents seized upon Bouquillon's arguments as being a doctrinal apology for the Faribault experiment. They rushed into print an answer to Bouquillon written by Father R. I. Holaind, S.J. The question asked in the title of the original pamphlet was answered by the title of Holaind's production: *The Parent First.*[49] The Jesuit flatly denied the primary authority of the state in matters of education. Catholic newspapers all over the East and Middle West picked up the controversy. It spread from their pages to those of the secular press. The New York *Herald* scored a sensation by securing an interview with Archbishop Ireland, who was in New York.

Ireland grasped the opportunity to explain his school plan. In the words of Gibbons, Ireland "had his war paint on."[50] With his usual bluntness he referred to Father Holaind's pamphlet as "quite unfair." He berated its author as being "stationary" while the "world moves." Speaking of Catholic periodicals which opposed the Faribault plan, he mentioned "some Catholic papers published in the German language, the true motives, however, of which are apprehended without much difficulty."[51] Ireland's bellicose frankness earned him the enmity of various individuals and groups. The German-Americans bore him no love. The archbishop's innuendo as to the reasons for their opposi-

[48] William J. Kerby, "Bouquillon," *Dictionary of American Biography*, II, 482.

[49] Bouquillon's brochure was published at Baltimore; Holaind's in New York.

[50] Reilly, *School Controversy*, p. 151.

[51] The interview appeared in the *Herald* of December 14, 1891. A large portion of it is printed in Reilly, *School Controversy*, pp. 94-99.

tion to his school plan did nothing to win their affection. Certain members of the Society of Jesus, in the United States and Italy, resented the comments on Father Holaind. Archbishop Michael A. Corrigan of New York was not one of Ireland's ardent admirers. He was irritated by the action of the St. Paul prelate in utilizing his presence within Corrigan's ecclesiastical jurisdiction to unburden himself so boldly on church matters. Corrigan was not sympathetic to Ireland's educational ideas. Ireland himself believed that Corrigan had requested Holaind to write the reply to Bouquillon. He evidently intended the interview to be an answer to Corrigan as much as to Holaind. No doubt Corrigan understood it for what it was.[52]

This was the point at which Cahenslyism once more became a lively issue in Catholic ecclesiastical affairs. Shortly before Ireland's outburst in New York, Father John Gmeiner of St. Paul had published a fiery attack on Cahenslyism which seriously offended the German-Americans.[53] The archbishop's own comments in New York convinced them that there was under way a concerted campaign to deprive them of their German-language parochial schools, and perhaps even of separate language parishes.[54] This belief was bolstered by the

[52] Cf. Reilly, *School Controversy*, pp. 99-101.

[53] *The Church and Foreignism* (St. Paul, 1891).

[54] The Baltimore Cathedral Archives contain an interesting group of documents from this period illustrating in some detail the kind of local problem that existed between German and English language parishes. The first of these documents is a Latin letter from Prefect Simeoni to Gibbons, Rome, November 30, 1891, informing the cardinal that Father William Faerber, rector of Our Lady of Victory Church (St. Mary's) in St. Louis had petitioned Propaganda for permission to build a new German church, asserting that he could obtain no satisfaction from Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick. Simeoni asked Gibbons to look into the matter and report (BCA, 89-D-7). Gibbons did so. An account of the difficulty is contained in a report to Gibbons by the Reverend Thomas J. Smith, Visitor of the Vincentians [Lazarists], from Perryville, Missouri, December 23, 1891. Father Smith wrote that the Lazarists maintained a "double congregation"—German and English—at St. Vincent's in St. Louis. There, he said, "The Germans are perfectly satisfied in spite of the interference of the 'Verein'." German Vicar-General Muehlsiepen and Faerber decided to build a new church within the territorial confines of St. Vincent's Parish. "We are not German enough for the 'Verein'." Kenrick denied permission (BCA, 89-F-7). Father Philip P. Brady, St Louis vicar-general for the English-speaking

publication in the *Catholic World* in January, 1892, of an article by the Reverend Henry A. Brann of New York attacking Cahenslyism in no uncertain terms. Brann answered in sequence the charges against the American Church set forth in the Lucerne memorial. He quoted historical facts and figures to show the exaggerated character of the claims concerning losses to the faith in this country. He ended his article with a peroration that could hardly have made pleasant reading for the German-Americans:

> We want no foreign bishops here, with the stamp of Kaiser Wilhelm or of Franz Joseph or of the Carbonaro Crispi on their mitres. We take European immigrants and we improve their condition, physically, mentally, and morally. Heaven knows many of them are poor specimens of European civilization and of European Christianity! . . . We say to fault-finders from Austria, purify the corrupt capital of your half-infidel empire; you French Gascons, look to the beams in your own eyes; you Macchiavellian intriguers at Rome, go preach the Gospel to the *Camorra* of Naples and to the *Mafia* of Sicily. We say to the Marchese Landi that until he and

---

clergy, wrote Gibbons from St. Louis on December 28, 1891. His version of the difficulty was much the same as that reported by Smith. He quoted the archdiocesan chancellor, Henry Van der Sanden, as saying: "The entire movement is for no other purpose, on the part of a few radical German Priests, than to destroy St. Vincent's Parish as a German and English Parish, and to force the Lazarists to have an exclusively English Parish" (BCA, 89-G-2). Gibbons, having received Smith's letter, wrote Simeoni on December 29, 1891: "Iste Faerber & ipse Vic. Generalis Muehlsieppen [*sic*] vulgo habentur ut duces eorum germanorum qui in hac regione multas turbationes excitant, et in civitate Sti. Ludovici asseritur eos in consilio transferendi Ecclesiam et in selectione situs motes fuisse desiderio et voluntate sibi attrahendi Germanos parochiae Sti Vincentii, et ita fovendi et angendi. . . . Haec omnia Rmo. Arch. postquam dederit consensu suum nota facta fuerunt, et tunc sapienter approbatio nem datam revocavit. Mihi omnino certum est que agendi rationem contra R. Faerber esse sustinendam pro bono & pace Ecclesiae in civitate Sti Ludovici" (BCA, 89-G-6). The cardinal again wrote Simeoni in Latin on January 8, 1892, evidently having received Brady's letter after sending off the first report to Propaganda. Gibbons reiterated his opinion in the case, and insisted that Kenrick's action in withdrawing the permission previously granted was fully justified (BCA, 89-H-6). A final note from Smith to Gibbons, Perryville, Missouri, January 11, 1892, informed the cardinal that the Lazarists' procurator general in Rome had been fully acquainted with the facts in order that he might defend their cause if necessary (BCA, 89-H-11).

his countrymen free Leo XIII from the chains which they have permitted to be fastened around the feet of his authority, they are in no position to criticise the Catholicity of other nations.[55]

Archbishop Ireland had in the meantime gone to Rome to defend his school plan before the Congregation of the Propaganda. He met there considerable opposition, led by Father Salvatore M. Brandi, S.J., one of the editors of the *Civiltà Cattolica,* an influential review that was sometimes credited with reflecting the opinions of the Vatican. Ireland was convinced that much, if not all, of the opposition to him and to his ideas had its origin in political considerations. This was evidenced in a letter to Cardinal Gibbons written from Rome on February 21, 1892:

> Rampolla is all right. . . . He is the dead enemy of the "Triplice aleanza" —the dark advance of which over America I pictured to him in Cahenslyism and its allies. I am all right with him, and he inspires the Pope.[56]

Other evidences of this belief also came to Gibbons' attention. Bishop James J. McGolrick of Duluth, Minnesota, wrote the cardinal on March 3:

> I just had a letter from Rome;—and the cleaning of the Augean stables was but play to the labor of going through the baskets of pamphlets, manuscripts, and letters sent against Archbishop Ireland and all his co-laborers in the work of rooting out prejudices and customs grown grey in German and French backwoods and 12th Century parishes.
>
> Each nation must grow up in this country with its own language and customs, even to beer and bolognas, and don't go near the Protestants—

[55] "Mr. Cahensly and the Church in the United States," LIV, 568-581. The figures on Catholic losses utilized by Brann in this article were furnished by John Gilmary Shea, editor of the *Catholic News* of New York. During 1891 Shea published a series of articles on "Catholic Losses" in the columns of the *Catholic News.* These articles were the subject of a correspondence between Shea and Archbishop Corrigan, who had asked the editor to prepare them. Later Corrigan and Cardinal Gibbons corresponded about the advisability of having them translated into French and published abroad. During this exchange of letters Corrigan mentioned the forthcoming article by Brann with evident approval. Cf. Shea to Corrigan, New York, November 3, 1891, with which are enclosed clippings of all of Shea's articles (NYAA, E, c); Gibbons to Corrigan, Baltimore, December 15, 19, 1891 (NYAA, C-15); Corrigan to Gibbons, New York, December 16 (BCA, 89-E-9), 22, 1891 (NYAA, C-18).

[56] BCA, 89-P-1.

to touch them is defilement. Two hours will bring me into the centre of Germany in America—where children of the Irish have to speak German or go without instruction. *God help us.*[57]

Archbishop Ireland reverted again to Cahenslyism toward the middle of March in an interview given in Rome to the correspondent of the Boston *Pilot,* a leading Catholic newspaper. Ireland referred to the multitude of letters being sent to Rome by opponents of his school plan in the United States. He spoke of the Vatican's determination to "maintain the hierarchical unity" of the Church in America. "But, strange to say," he added, "this . . . does not prevent constant renewal of efforts. There are people in America and in Europe who are under the positive belief that the country is a wild Congo, to be partitioned off into so many foreign colonies." To this he appended a scornful note on Cahensly's "lie in his famous memorial of last summer" concerning losses to the Catholic faith among immigrants.[58]

There is no doubt that Ireland was the object of concerted and virulent attacks by opponents of his school plan. His religious orthodoxy was called into serious question both in Rome and in the United States. Archbishops Katzer of Milwaukee and Corrigan of New York, as well as Bishop McQuaid of Rochester, and others were largely responsible for these attacks.[59] Ireland was a fighter who minced no words in answering an opponent. He seemed thoroughly convinced that the opposition to him was dictated by German-Austrian-Italian political considerations. It is difficult to agree with his opinion in view of the attitude maintained by certain of his opponents on the question of hierarchial jurisdiction. It is, furthermore, significant that the whole question of Cahenslyism, after supposedly being settled by action of the Holy See itself, was first raised again by Ireland

[57] BCA, 89-Q-4.

[58] March 19, 1892.

[59] Cf. Cardinal Gibbons' comments in a letter of April 11, 1892 to Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia: "I am pained to see the abuse heaped on Archbishop Ireland. . . . I think the Prelates of the American Church ought to stand by one another. . . . I am praying and sighing for peace" (BCA, 89-T-9). For the attitude of Bishop McQuaid towards Ireland, cf. Frederick J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid* . . . (Rochester, New York, 1925-1927), III, 160-251.

of St. Paul, Gmeiner of St. Paul, McGolrick of Duluth, and finally, United States Senator Cushman Kellogg Davis of Minnesota. The latter, on April 22, 1892, during a debate on the floor of the Senate on Chinese immigration, charged that Cahenslyism was a more serious threat to the security of the United States than any oriental immigration would be for a considerable time to come.

This action on the part of a senator from Ireland's home state, taken at the very moment when the Congregation of the Propaganda was supposedly still considering whether to approve or disapprove Ireland's school plan, seems suspiciously well-timed. Monsignor O'Connell had written Gibbons from Rome in August, 1891, that there were powerful individuals at the Vatican who would be dissuaded from interference with the American hierarchy only by intervention of the civil power in the United States. In the same letter, discussing Roman opinion of Ireland's attitude on "national" bishops, O'Connell advised Gibbons to "Let the question go before Congress."[60]

If Ireland's ideas as to the reasons of the opposition against him were correct, evidently certain of his chief opponents were being used as dupes by the German group. Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati was not in sympathy with the Faribault plan, yet he wrote congratulations to Gibbons on April 18, 1892, at "your skill in putting a rivet into the assurance that there should be no 'national' bishops."[61] Archbishop Corrigan, too, must have been duped as to the real motives of the opposition to Ireland, if the St. Paul prelate's explanation of them was accurate. There can be no doubt of the animosity that existed between the two men.[62]

The "rivet" to which Elder referred was a letter addressed to the American Church through Cardinal Gibbons by the new Prefect of Propaganda, Miecislaus Cardinal Ledochowski. At the direction of

[60] BCA, 88-U-2.

[61] BCA, 89-U-3. The Cardinal of Baltimore had written, on January 14, 1892, a letter of thanks to Leo XIII for his care of the American Church, and had included therein a paragraph emphasizing the Pope's wisdom in allaying American fears by refusing to consider the appointment of "national" bishops (BCA, 89-J-7).

[62] Cf. BCA, 89-W-8, Ireland to Gibbons, Genoa, June 5, 1892: "The Pope has decided that bishops must be in touch with their country. There is, he said to me,

the Pope, he again reassured the hierarchy that it was the desire of the Holy See that American bishops be chosen only on the basis of procedures approved by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and that there was no intention of infringing upon the proper jurisdiction of the American prelates.[63] Gibbons sent a copy of this letter to Corrigan with comments that indicated expectation of appreciation from Corrigan for the assurances conveyed by the Cardinal Prefect.[64] Later events demonstrated clearly that Corrigan was as indignant as was Ireland at the claims of Catholic losses made by the representatives of the European St. Raphael Societies, and that he had no conscious sympathy with any movement designed to partition the jurisdiction of American bishops along national lines.

The evidence at hand does not show conclusively whether Ireland used the fear of foreign intervention as a means of securing acceptance of his ideas on "Americanization" of the Church, or whether he was sincerely convinced of the foreign threat to American institutions. The European groups interested in the lot of American immigrants took steps at this point to deny any wish of interfering in the internal affairs of the American Church. Toward the middle of April, 1892, representatives of the German, Austrian, Belgian, and Italian St. Raphael Societies addressed a letter to Cardinal Rampolla that called attention to that portion of Rampolla's communication to Gibbons of June 28, 1891, which read: "We have come to learn that certain of these associations . . . propose to obtain for each group of emigrants . . . a representative among the members of the American hierarchy devoted peculiarly to their interests." On this passage they commented:

Eine Anschuldigung, welche besonders unseren Herzen schmerzlich war, ist die, dass wir uns einmischen wolten in die innere Regierung der Kirche, noch mehr, dass wir die hierarchische Ordnung, welche in den Vereinigten

---

otherwise no hope for the Church. He is determined to put down 'intransigeants,' reactionaries, and men of backward movements. To his mind Corrigan is a prince of such men."

[63] BCA, 89-V-10, Rome, May 15, 1892, in Latin.

[64] NYAA, C-44, Baltimore, June 6, 1892. Cf. *Freeman's Journal*, June 1, 1892 (NYAA, L).

Staaten besteht, umstürzen wollten, indem wir nationale Bischöfe verlangen, denen Jurisdiction über ihre Nationalangehörigen zustehen würde. Es wird aber genügen, die bestressende Stelle aus unserem Memorandum hier wiederzugeben, um eine Voraussetzung zu widerlegen, die unseren Absichten, wie unseren katholischen Empfindungen widerspricht:

> "Es würde sehr wünschenwerth sein, dass die Katholiken jeder Nationalität, da, wo dies für möglich erachtet wird, im Episcopat des Landes ihrer Einwanderung einige Bischöfe haben, die der nämlichen Abkunft sind."

Der Sinn dieses Wunsches kann doch nicht zweideutig sein, im Zusammenhange mit einem Schriftstück, welches für den Vater der Christenheit bestimmt ist.

Wir legen in voller katholischer Offenheit die Gefahren dar, welche unsere Erfahrung in Auswanderungsangelegenheiten uns vor Augen führt und wir unterbreiten dem erleuchteten Urtheil und der hohen Weisheit des hl. Vaters einige Mittel, die uns geignet erscheinen, die geistigen Gefahren, die aus der Auswanderung erwachsen, zu beseitigen oder zu vermindern. Wir haben uns darauf beschränkt, wie dies unsere Pflicht war, einen Wunsch, auszusprechen, den Wunsch nämlich, zu sehen, wie die höchste Autorität in Erwägung ziehe, ob es nicht angezeicht erscheine, wenn die Umstände es erlauben, den verschiedenen Nationen einen oder mehrer Bischöfe ihrer Nationalität im amerikanischen Episcopat zu gewähren.[65]

Rampolla acknowledged the communication on April 28, 1892, with a non-committal letter to the President of the German St.-Raphaels Verein, Count Isenburg-Birstein. He stated that the letter had been submitted to Leo XIII, and that the "re-translation" referred to had been accepted at its face value.[66]

These protestations by the St. Raphael Societies may not have been sincere, but a number of influential American bishops who were not members of the German-American group placed confidence in them. Corrigan, McQuaid, and others evidently thought that Ireland was using Cahenslyism as a red herring to divert attention from the obnoxious character of his school reforms. They, like Ireland, opposed

[65] Peter Paul Cahensly, *Der St. Raphaelsverein zum Schutze Katholischer deutscher Auswanderer, Sein Werden, Wirken und Kämpfen während des 30. jährigen Bestehens erzählt von dessen derzeitigen Präsidenten* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1900) [*Charitas-Schriften*, Heft 5], pp. 47-48.

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

all suggestions for the appointment of "national" bishops in the United States. They believed that the earlier Cahensly memorials had stemmed from false information and an over-zealous attitude. They did not, however, question the motives of the European or American supporters of the petitions. They saw no reality in Ireland's hint of dark threats to the political security of the United States. The core of the dispute and, in many ways, its saddest aspect, was the refusal of both parties to admit the honesty of their opponents' convictions. Ireland and his supporters evidently believed that Katzer and his following, including Corrigan and McQuaid, were consciously dissimulating the motives of their opposition to "Americanization." The other side was equally unimpressed by Ireland's fulminations about the underlying political issues which he saw involved in the whole question. They attributed his attitude to purely personal considerations of expediency. Mutual lack of confidence, plus an amazing absence of Christian charity, bred personal animosities of the worst kind.

Senator Davis' public strictures on Cahenslyism were answered by Cahensly himself on June 3, 1892. He gave to the press on May 30 the gist of a letter to Davis which denied any desire on the part of the St.-Raphaels Verein to interfere with the rights and functions of the American episcopate. He assured the senator that there was no political purpose or connection behind the movement, and that the emigrant-aid societies desired only that there be appointed bishops to minister to the spiritual needs of the emigrants. Such bishops, he said, should act only in concert with the American bishops.[67] Davis, informed of Cahensly's answer before he had received the letter, commented to the press: "It is not likely that there is anything in it which will change my views as to the enormity of Cahensly's offense against our institutions."[68] His personal answer to Cahensly's letter was brief and non-committal, being little more than an acknowledgment of receipt.[69]

The explanation of the offending paragraph of the Lucerne memorial which Cahensly gave to Davis was substantially the same as that

[67] *Freeman's Journal*, June 1, 1892 (NYAA, L). [68] *Ibid.*

[69] Davis' reply, June 7, 1892, was printed in German translation in the Cincinnati *Der Wahrheits-Freund*, December 7, 1892.

which the St. Raphael Societies had transmitted to Cardinal Rampolla for the consideration of the Pope. It was also the apologia subsequently used by the American friends of Cahensly. Granting that it was entirely sincere, it is not difficult to understand why Cahensly's opponents found this explanation so unsatisfactory. What Cahensly suggested—the appointment of "bishops to minister to the spiritual needs" of the immigrants, who should "act only in concert with the American bishops"—was an administrative anachronism. Such division of spiritual jurisdiction—for it could be nothing else—would violate every rule of hierarchical organization. It could not help but create division and misunderstanding within the American Church. There may have been no intent in the proposal to interfere with the internal administration of the Church in the United States, but had it been carried out, that effect would nonetheless have resulted. The kindest judgment that could be passed upon those who supported this idea was that they were innocently naive in matters of ecclesiastical administration. Ireland and his friends might be pardoned a certain amount of scepticism concerning the motives of their opponents, for it is hard to believe that such a degree of naïveté could exist in the minds of responsible administrative officials.

Archbishop Corrigan of New York did not believe in the accusations of interference made against Cahensly. The two men, Corrigan and Cahensly, carried on what was evidently a fairly steady correspondence. Leo House in New York was one of the most important overseas branches of the St.-Raphaels Verein. Corrigan, as its honorary president and ecclesiastical superior, found more than one occasion to report upon its progress. In these letters he customarily expressed confidence in the aims and value of Cahensly's work.[70]

Agitation against Cahenslyism during the summer of 1892 was marked by a new outburst from St. Paul on the "conspiracy." The Reverend John Conway, editor of the *Northwestern Chronicle*, Catholic paper of that city, published in the *Review of Reviews* what purported to be a factual history of the attempt to impose "national"

[70] Cf. Corrigan to Cahensly, New York, June 3, 1892, *Der Wahrheits-Freund*, August 17, 1892. Cf. also New York *Herald* (undated) on the work of Leo House and the St.-Raphaels Verein (NYAA, E, c).

bishops on the American Church. Conway wrote: "A political move is covered under the name of religion." He specifically named archbishops, bishops, priests, and laymen who instigated the "plot." Archbishop Katzer of Milwaukee, "Cahensly's protege," led the list. Conway concluded that the "conspiracy" was deepening at home and abroad, and that it was necessary for all Americans of all creeds to unite to prevent foreign attempts to control the United States.[71]

Katzer was stung into instantaneous protest. He at once wrote Cardinal Gibbons a long letter, labelling Conway's article "a most malicious and most slanderous reproduction of all the false accusations which had appeared before."

> Your Eminence will undoubtedly recollect what has transpired at our meeting in St. Louis, at which in the presence of all the Archbishops I have repudiated any and every knowledge of and connection with the Luzerne conference and its subsequent petition to the Propaganda and the Holy Father. I may add, that even the very name of Cahensly was unknown to me so much so, that when I read his name first in the Am. Papers, I did not know whether he was a Swiss or German or Slave [*sic*]. . . .
>
> I am an Austrian by birth, Cahensly is a member of the German Reichstag and Baron Schlötzer was Prussian Ambassador—whether they have expressed themselves concerning me or not, I cannot and I do not know, but suppose they have, is this to be laid at my door, will this justify any ecclesiastic to make accusations "of even conspiring with foreign powers" and this against an Archbishop. . . .
>
> To my knowledge I have given not even a shadow of ground, which could justify those false and most hateful assertions.
>
> If I hold different opinions in the School question and with regard to societies is the [*sic*] a reason to belie me in a manner which is almost diabolical.[72]

Tempers on both sides had been aroused as a result of Propaganda's decision on Archbishop Ireland's school plan. Rome, after consider-

[71] "'Cahenslyism' Versus Americanism," VI (August, 1892), 43-48.

[72] BCA, 90-B-4, Milwaukee, August 3, 1892. The cardinal replied to Katzer on August 14, saying he had not read Conway's article, but that he accepted fully, and always had, Katzer's disavowal of any connection with the Lucerne conference (BCA, 90-B-9).

ing Ireland's explanation of the Faribault system and the reasons for adopting it, replied *"Tolerari potest."* Something was to be "tolerated." But what? Corrigan and others announced that the decision meant only that at Faribault and Stillwater, under special circumstances, the compromise between parochial and public control of the primary school might be permitted. This, they argued, meant a defeat for Ireland, since the further extension of the Faribault idea remained unapproved. The "liberals" interpreted *"tolerari potest"* quite differently. They claimed that with those words the Congregation of the Propaganda approved the basic idea involved, and that there was now no possible question of the legitimate character of similar school arrangements anywhere in the United States. The dispute waxed virulent between the spring and fall of 1892. Charges and counter-charges were flung heedlessly back and forth by the prelates involved. The Catholic and secular press carried columns of news items and editorial opinion on the matter, most of it partisan in character. Charges of theft of documents and forgery were freely aired. Cardinal Gibbons, the highest-ranking American prelate, held his peace, although even he was obliged to protect himself from insinuations of partiality carried in the public prints.[73] Where his sympathies lay was a matter of common knowledge to the members of the hierarchy, although he had the good judgment to refrain from participation in the war of invective. He had written Leo XIII a warm defense of Ireland's school plan and of the archbishop's motives in sponsoring it.[74] He followed up this action by recommending Ireland's designation to the cardinalate on the grounds of personal merit and public reputation.[75] The widespread publicity given to the war of insults among the members of the hierarchy prompted Monsignor O'Connell to write Gibbons from Rome:

[73] Cf. his letter to Corrigan, BCA, 89-V-12, Baltimore, May 18, 1892.

[74] BCA, 89-Q-1, Baltimore, March 1, 1892, in French. An English translation is in Reilly, *School Controversy*, pp. 143-147. It was printed in most American Catholic newspapers of the time.

[75] BCA, 89-T-14, Gibbons to Rampolla, Baltimore, April 15, 1892, in French.

Never did I dream that such foulness could ever come out of the American Church as the past two years have brought forth. The Episcopate has fallen greatly in the opinion of the Romans.[76]

The continuous belaboring of Cahenslyism as a threat to American institutions called forth vigorous rebuttals from the German-Americans. The Thirty-Ninth General Congress of German Catholics was held at Mainz between August 28 and September 1, 1892.[77] The St.-Raphaels Verein held its meeting in conjunction with the general congress. Monsignor Joseph Schroeder and Dr. Joseph Pohle, two members of the faculty of the Catholic University of America, were in attendance. There, on September 1, 1892, Schroeder delivered an address praising warmly the work of Cahensly and the St.-Raphaels Verein. He drew a glowing picture of the collaboration among Corrigan, Katzer, Bishop Zardetti of St. Cloud, Dr. Sebastian G. Messmer of the Catholic University of America, and others in the struggle to save the faith of European immigrants by protecting the existence of the parochial schools of America. He ridiculed the claim that Cahenslyism had its origin in political considerations, or that it was directed at interfering in any way with American institutions, ecclesiastical or social. Dr. Pohle concurred in these sentiments.[78] Schroeder, on his return to America, wrote Archbishop Corrigan, with whom he was on intimate terms:

Mr. Cahensly vous a déjà écrit que j'ai profité de la grande assemblée catholique de Mayence pour réfuter les calomnies dont cet homme qui est réellement un catholique modèle, a été l'objet. Les journaux de ce jour, où il est question des déclarations de Mgr. Ireland et de Mr. Davis au sujet de Cahenslyism, me prouvent qu'on continue la guerre déloyale en excitant les susceptibilités américaines.[79]

Nearer home, the principal German protests were registered at the Sixth German-American Catholic Congress, held in Newark, New Jersey, September 26-29, 1892, and at the meeting of the Priester-

[76] BCA, 91-G-10, March 14, 1893.

[77] For the program of the congress cf. *Der Wahrheits-Freund,* July 27, 1892.

[78] Schroeder's address is in *ibid.,* September 21, 1892.

[79] NYAA, C-43, Allentown, Pennsylvania, 1892.

Verein which accompanied it. Archbishop Corrigan addressed the congress on Cahenslyism:

> From letters which I have received from the other side I can say positively that there was no political end in view in the measure. It was intended solely to benefit the spiritual welfare of the immigrant by keeping him for a time among those who know his language.

He recounted the action of the Holy See in rejecting the Lucerne memorial, and added:

> The secretary of the St. Raphael's Society Herr Peter Paul Cahensly, at once accepted that decision, and he accepted it loyally. I received a letter from him yesterday declaring that he submits himself in all things to the judgment of the Holy See.[80]

Among the resolutions adopted by the Priester-Verein was one addressed to the Pope condemning the attacks upon Cahensly and the St.-Raphaels Verein. This resolution was seconded by Monsignor Schroeder with a talk on the true meaning of Cahenslyism. He repeated many of the arguments he had put forward at Mainz, and answered especially Conway's attack in the August number of the *Review of Reviews*. His tone was moderate and carried conviction.[81]

Corrigan, although positive that Cahensly was being seriously maligned, had little patience with European charges that millions of immigrants had lost their Catholic faith because of neglect of their welfare by the American Church. He evidently asked Cardinal Gibbons early in September, 1892, whether the attention of the Holy See should not be called to the exaggerated claims being made on this score. The fact was that while the European St. Raphael Societies had withdrawn or reinterpreted their request for "national"

[80] New York *Herald*, September 28; *Freeman's Journal*, October 1, 1892 (NYAA, L).

[81] The proceedings of the congress were published in *Der Wahrheits-Freund*, September 28, October 5, 12, 19, 26, 1892. They were separately printed under the title: *Verhandlungen der Sechsten Deutsch-Amerikanischen Katholiken-Versammlung, abgehalten in Newark, New Jersey, am 26., 27., 28. und 29. September, 1892* (New York, 1892). The resolution on Cahensly, and Schroeder's speech, in corrected and expanded form, are in the New York *Catholic Herald*, February 25, 1893.

bishops in the United States, they were still busily emphasizing the need for better protection for immigrants. In doing so, they continued to claim tremendous losses to the faith in the United States. Gibbons replied to Corrigan on September 5 suggesting that the New York archbishop draft a letter to the Pope on the subject and submit it for approval to the archbishops at their annual meeting scheduled for New York on November 16, 1892.[82]

This meeting was a crucial one in the history of the American Church. Pope Leo XIII was vastly perturbed by the internal dissensions aroused by the decision of Propaganda on Ireland's school plan. He decided to send a personal representative to attend the next meeting of the American archbishops. This was an action that required delicate handling. The American hierarchy was not in a mood to receive advice on domestic questions from a foreigner, even though he might have behind him all the prestige of the Pope of Rome. Archbishop Francesco Satolli was sent to the United States with the somewhat limited powers of a papal ablegate for the ostensible purpose of representing the Holy See at the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. He brought with him various precious cartographical exhibits from the Vatican collections for loan to the United States Government. Cardinal Gibbons was given to understand that Satolli would have something to say to the American archbishops in his capacity as personal representative of the Pope.

After visits to Cardinal Gibbons in Baltimore, and to the President in Washington, the ablegate went to St. Paul, where he remained with Archbishop Ireland until the meeting in New York. Satolli divulged at the meeting that he had been sent by Leo XIII to effect an end to the school controversy. He produced a set of "propositions" which, he said, reflected the mind of the Pope in the matter. These "propositions" defined the character of Catholic primary education. In general, they constituted a vindication of Ireland's policies.[83] The archbishops assented to the propositions, but controversy was not ended thereby. Katzer, Corrigan, and many suffragan bishops were

[82] NYAA, C-44, Baltimore.

[83] The text of the propositions is in Reilly, *School Controversy*, Appendix G, pp. 271-276.

dissatisfied with Satolli's solution, and questioned his authority. The situation was not bettered by the fact that the Pope had also asked his representative to sound out American opinion as to the establishment of a permanent Apostolic Delegation in the United States. This was a step which the American hierarchy hoped the Pope would not take. It feared that such action might arouse needless Protestant prejudice. Leo XIII was well aware of American feeling on the subject, but his patience was wearing a bit thin.[84]

Adverse criticism of the Satolli propositions by members of the hierarchy and in the columns of the Catholic press centered largely on the claim that the papal ablegate had no authority to impose a solution of the problem on the American Church. The language used with regard to Satolli was unguarded and on occasion, positively insulting. Cardinal Gibbons wrote to Rome that only an encyclical letter from the Pope himself would quiet the controversy. Leo XIII evidently decided it was time to exact respect for his agent, and to bring an end to the disgraceful conduct of the hierarchy. Without previous warning an Apostolic Delegation for the United States was created, and Satolli was made first delegate. This was in January, 1893. On May 31, 1893, the Pope sent to Gibbons the encyclical letter on education which the cardinal had suggested. Once the highest authority in the Church had spoken personally in the most solemn manner possible, discussion of the school question was ended.[85]

This was the milieu in which Cahenslyism lived out its last days as an active disruptive force in American Catholic Church life. The

[84] In 1891, Leo XIII had said to Monsignor O'Connell, in a tone of "sorrowful regret and surprise:" "The whole evil is this: that they do not want to have a representative of me there. If they had one of my representatives there now, that could speak to them the sentiments of the Pope, this trouble would never have happened. But for some reason of jealousy among themselves, they don't want to have my representative there tho' I would only name some one acceptable to them all. Why don't they want the Pope there? If Christ were to return again to earth, you would all rejoice to give him a welcome. Why not then receive his Vicar. No, if I had my *Nunzio* there, all would go better and you would be rendered independent at once of the Propaganda and made depend immediately on the department of State," BCA, 88-S-1, O'Connell to Gibbons, Rome, July 1, 1891.

[85] Reilly, *School Controversy*, pp. 223-230.

archbishops' meeting at New York considered and approved a statement written by Archbishop Corrigan

> in which he refuted the misrepresentations made by Mr. Cahensly and some of his adherents to the Holy See concerning the number of defections from the Church of emigrants. This statement was signed by all the prelates and ordered to be forwarded to the Holy Father.[86]

The letter to Leo XIII was an able refutation of Cahensly's charge that 16,000,000 Catholic emigrants had lost the faith in the United States. It defended the manner in which the American hierarchy watched over the spiritual needs of Catholic communicants, and emphasized the European origin of many of the causes for loss of faith by emigrants.[87]

One of the most vociferous agitations over Cahenslyism during these troublous years was initiated by the Reverend Patrick Corrigan, pastor of Our Lady of Grace Church, Hoboken, New Jersey. The Hoboken pastor took violent exception to the resolution applauding Cahensly which had been adopted by the Newark German-American Catholic Congress in September, 1892. In the columns of the New York *Sun* on October 29 he had published a sharp attack upon the German-American Priester-Verein, charging it with "treason to Church and State," and of "conspiracy to Germanize this country by means of the Catholic Church."[88] These comments set off a brief but vehement quarrel between Corrigan on the one hand and the Reverend L. Hofschneider, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul Church, Hoboken, on the other. Hofschneider took up cudgels for the Priester-Verein, of which he was an officer. He classified Corrigan's assertions as "false and unfounded." He denied all connection between Cahensly and the Priester-Verein, but at the same time explained Cahenslyism as nothing more than a desire "to save the faith of the German immigrant."[89]

[86] BCA, 90-Q-3, Minutes of the Third Annual Conference of the Most Rev. Archbishops of the United States held in New York, Nov. 16, 17, 18, 19 A.D. 1892, p. 19, Nov. 17, 3:30 P. M.

[87] NYAA, I-41, November 16, 1892, in Latin.

[88] A collection of pertinent newspaper clippings documenting this particular quarrel is in NYAA, L.

[89] Jersey City *News*, November 14, 1892. Cf. *Catholic Herald*, December 12, 1892.

Not only Father Hofschneider, but other priests of the Diocese of Newark were involved in the discussions which took place. Secular papers, particularly the New York *Times* and the *Sun*, as well as the Catholic *Freeman's Journal*, published with gusto lengthy communications from Father Corrigan and his opponents. The irate priest made use of language throughout the controversy which was exceptionally disrespectful to his immediate ecclesiastical superior, Bishop Winand M. Wigger of Newark and to his metropolitan Archbishop Corrigan of New York. By November 28, Bishop Wigger considered that he had sufficient reason to bring Father Corrigan before an ecclesiastical court on the charge of publishing false statements. The trial was scheduled for December 12, 1892. It was never carried through, but was settled by an apology from the priest to his bishop for any expressions "violating the respect due to you and also to the Most Rev. Metropolitan Archbishop Corrigan."[90]

The documents in the case leave no doubt of Father Corrigan's warped interpretation of the Newark resolution. Monsignor Schroeder expressed to Archbishop Corrigan what was no doubt the typical German-American reaction to Corrigan's strictures. "Il me semble," he wrote,

> que la paix ne peut revenir, si dans la question du Cahenslyism notre mot d'ordre n'est pas: Roma locuta, ergo causa finita. Car les adversaires sont inaccessibles à tout argument; ils ne veulent pas même voir la vérité cent fois démontré et continue à s'attaquer avec acharnement à la bonne foi de Cah.—*pour* frapper les Cahenslyistes en Amérique! En constatant l'accord unanime avec laquelle la presse catholique-libérale et les journaux soidisant incolores, Herald, Sun, etc. préconisent le "mouvement" provoqué par un prêtre désobéissant et irrespectueux à l'égard de son évêque, je dois, me semble-t-il croire, qu'il y a du système en tout cela.[91]

Archbishop Corrigan evidently acquainted Herr Cahensly himself with the action taken at the archbishops' meeting in November for, on December 31, 1892, Cahensly wrote to the New York prelate:

> May it please your Grace to accept my heartfelt thanks for your esteemed favor of the 25th ult. . . . .

[90] *Freeman's Journal*, December 24, 1892.

[91] NYAA, C-43, Washington, December 4, 1892.

About the number of Catholics, who should have lost their faith in the United States of Amerika I will admit that the number of 16 millions was somewhat too high. But I must beg your Grace to consider, that these 16 millions comprise not only the immigrated emigrants personally, but also their children and their children's children. . . . If the Petition and the Memorial of the European Raphael-societies, presented by me to the Holy Father, have but contributed to the saving of souls, I will feel amply rewarded for all the trouble I undertook and for the disgraceful abuses I have been made to suffer.[92]

The effective life of Cahenslyism as a force in American Church affairs was over by this time. It is significant that the threat of "national" bishops seemed to disappear at the same time the troublesome school controversy was settled by the personal action of Pope Leo XIII. The conflict between "liberal" and "conservative" groups within the hierarchy continued. The issue of American versus foreign nationalism had still many years of life left in it, but Cahenslyism appeared to be extinct. Certain individuals of minor importance attempted to agitate the matter after the beginning of 1893, but the hierarchy seemed willing to forget the fears and trepidations that had afflicted some of its members before that date. The Catholic *Union and Times* of Buffalo, New York, carried on an ill-mannered feud during January and February, 1893, with its "esteemed contemporary" the Catholic *Volksfreund,* also of Buffalo, which included many allusions to the "Cahenslyite conspiracy."[93]

Peter Wallrath, editor and proprietor of the Logansport, Indiana *Sternenbanner,* after attending as a delegate the 1893 Congress of the Roman Catholic Central Verein, was moved to write Cardinal Gibbons a long and detailed letter unmasking what he considered a plot to Germanize the United States. The aim of the leaders of this conspiracy, he wrote, was to present Ireland, Gibbons, and Satolli as the great enemies of true religion and education in the United States. The school question, Wallrath believed, was merely a blind to shield the true political motives of the plotters.[94] Cardinal Gibbons'

[92] NYAA, G-1, Cahensly, Limburg a. d. Lahn.

[93] Cf. NYAA, L, for a file of clippings from the *Union and Times.*

[94] BCA, 92-W-5, Logansport, Indiana, December 25, 1893.

reaction to this missive is not a matter of record, but no doubt he was content to let the question drop.

The Cardinal of Baltimore found another painful echo of the Cahensly difficulties in Dr. Joseph Pohle's letter of resignation from the faculty of the Catholic University of America, submitted to him as chancellor of that institution. Mentioning the identity of his views with those of Monsignor Schroeder, Pohle wrote:

> I pass a similar judgment upon his attitude in the s. c. movement against Cahenslyism. Whilst condemning in common with him the policy falsely ascribed to Mr. Cahensly, I have publicly protested in unison with him against such a scandalous crusade, based upon calumnious misrepresentations. I do not regret it; I even declare that this unchristian agitation influenced not a little my determination to leave America. Certain parties have accused us of a narrow national spirit, from which we were and still are far removed, perhaps more so, than our accusers themselves.[95]

As though to signify the end of Cahenslyism, the Seventh German-American Catholic Congress met at Louisville, Kentucky, in September, 1894, in a spirit of peace and harmony. For the first time in many years the meetings of this group did not give rise to charges of attempted domination of the American Church.[96]

Cahensly and the St.-Raphaels Verein continued their work for the welfare of German Catholic immigrants. Occasionally during the years that followed references to the "conspiracy" appeared in print. They were in the nature of post-mortems, in spite of the generally partial attitude of their authors. W. H. Thorne, editor of the *Globe*, a somewhat belligerent Catholic review published in New York, printed in 1896 a letter which he had received three years before. The author of this letter charged in violent language that Cahenslyism was a plot "to make America German."[97]

The removal of Bishop John J. Keane as Rector of the Catholic University of America in September, 1896, inspired "A Catholic

[95] BCA, 93-D-9, Washington, end of March, 1894, printed.

[96] Cf. *Verhandlungen der Siebenten Deutsch-Amerikanischen Katholiken-Versammlung, abgehalten in Louisville, Ky. am 24., 25., 26. und 27. September 1894* (Louisville, 1894).

[97] The Reverend B. G. Lentz, "Was There A Conspiracy?", VI (1896), 392-394. Editor Thorne felt that the answer to the question posed was "No!"

Priest" to charge "conspiracy" as an explanation of that event. *The Independent* printed an account of the Abbelen mission to Rome in 1886, and included in it the text of the memorial with which Ireland and Keane had combatted the Abbelen petition before the Congregation of the Propaganda. The article concluded:

> This German faction of conspirators received a crushing defeat at Rome; yet . . . they still do business at the old stand.
>
> For ten long years the wound dealt them in Rome by Bishops Ireland and Keane has rankled in their hearts. They have constantly tried to harass and to injure Archbishop Ireland, ... Bishop Keane has not fared better at their hands. No prelate belonging to their faction ever had a kind or encouraging word for him. The German party never contributed to the Catholic University; they persistently opposed its success, because Bishop Keane was its head. Their newspapers now boast that they have brought about the downfall of this enlightened and progressive American bishop; they also boast that Ireland will be their next victim.[98]

Peter Paul Cahensly himself provided additional documentation in a letter to Archbishop Corrigan dated April 10, 1899. He acknowledged the receipt from Corrigan of an English translation of the "Apostolical letter of our most holy Lord Leo XIII."[99] He expressed the hope that the letter would calm the minds of American Catholics. In a separate paragraph he informed Corrigan:

> Mr. Brunnetière, director of the "Revue des deux mondes" at Paris had published in the novembre-number an article "Le catholicisme aux Etats-Unis," in which the known false accusations against the "St. Raphaels Vereine" and my person were repeated. I did send a rectification to Mr. Brunetière, but he refused the printing. My lettre has been published in the "Verité" of Paris, in the "Revue canonique" number 5 (month of march). Also Mr. Arthur Preuss has brought in the "Review No 51" (9. march 1899) an article "Mr. Cahensly shows up Brunetière."[100]

The following year, 1900, Cahensly published a complete explanation

[98] NYAA, L, "The German Conspiracy in 1886" (January 14, 1897), 5-6.

[99] This was evidently the letter *Testem Benevolentiae* by which Leo XIII hoped to end the doctrinal controversy over "Americanism." It was dated January 22, 1899.

[100] NYAA, G-1, Limburg a.d. Lahn. The errors of spelling and orthography appear in the original.

of Cahenslyism in the pamphlet series of the St.-Raphaels Verein.[101]

Cahenslyism may have been dead by this time. The number of autopsies performed upon its corpse would lead one so to believe. Nevertheless, its ghost was seen stalking in high places. This was natural so long as the man from whom its name derived continued to live and to manifest an interest in American Catholic immigrants. Cahensly was received by Leo XIII once more on December 28, 1902, as he had been also in 1895. Immediately rumors were circulated to the effect that he was reviving the demand for the appointment of "national" bishops in the United States. Arthur Preuss, editor of *The Review. A Weekly Magazine,* of St. Louis, came to his defense. According to Preuss, Cahensly spoke with the Pope at length about the necessity of providing properly for the spiritual welfare of the "many thousands of non-English speaking Catholic immigrants in the United States." Preuss continued:

> In view of the fact that of the 420,000 Catholics who came to the United States during the past fiscal year, no less than 180,000 were Italians and 190,000 Slavs, Mr. Cahensly declares in the *St. Raphael's-Blatt* (No. 70) that it would be arrogant on his part to make any such demands [for the appointment of German bishops in the United States] in the interest of the eight to ten thousand German Catholic immigrants who now arrive in this country annually.[102]

Bishop J. Regis Canevin of Pittsburgh is sole authority for the statement that Cahensly "presented another memorial to the Holy Father" in June, 1910. He made no implication concerning Cahensly's motives in so doing, but mentioned only the unreliable figures on losses to the Catholic faith among immigrants to the United States used by Cahensly.[103]

The same year, 1910, Cahensly visited the United States again. He

[101] *Charitas-Schriften.* Cf. note 65 above.

[102] "Leo XIII, Cahensly, and the Society of St. Raphael," X (June 25,1903), 385-388. Cf. also *ibid.* (January 22, 1903), 47-48.

[103] *An Examination Historical and Statistical into Losses and Gains of the Catholic Church in the United States from 1790 to 1910* (Pittsburgh, 1912), p. 7. Canevin's statement concerning the existence of a 1910 Cahensly memorial is repeated by Gerald Shaughnessy. *Has the Immigrant kept the Faith?* (New York, 1925), p. 232.

called upon Archbishop John Farley who had been appointed to the See of New York after the death of Corrigan. Received by Farley on October 3, he was asked by the prelate to submit to him before his departure from this country an account of his observations on the treatment accorded Catholic immigrants in the United States, and suggestions "as to the betterment of any existing evil conditions."[104] Farley's technique leads to the suspicion that he wished to forestall all possibility of complaints being taken to Rome before being made known in America. Cahensly complied with the request and sent to Farley several pages of Catholic immigration statistics and suggestions for the better care of immigrants. He thought that it would be of great value to set up an international bureau where foreign priests desirous of coming to America might register, and where American bishops in need of the services of such individuals might locate the men they required with a minimum of trouble. Cahensly also advocated the creation of well-equipped homes for newly-arrived immigrants in such cities as Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, and Galveston.[105]

It is still impossible to speak with authority concerning the true meaning of Cahenslyism. The facts necessary to come to a definitive conclusion are not available. This has not prevented superficial judgments being made. Allen S. Will called Cahenslyism the most serious threat to progress ever faced by American Catholicism. He considered it an active manifestation of political Pan-Germanism that promised danger to the security of the United States and to the independence of the American Catholic Church.[106] It is equally superficial (and equally dangerous) to conclude, as did Father John Rothensteiner, that "Americanism, as a religious issue, is as dead as Marley, and Cahenslyism never was any more real than Marley's ghost."[107] Ghost it may have been, but like Marley's ghost, it was capable of producing remarkable results.

[104] NYAA, G-1, Cahensly to Farley, New York, October 8, 1910.

[105] NYAA, G-1, enclosed with Cahensly to Farley, October 8, 1910.

[106] *The Life of Cardinal Gibbons* (New York, 1922), I, 498, 541.

[107] *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis in its Various Stages of Development from A.D. 1673 to A.D. 1928* (St. Louis, 1928), II, 562.

Happily, the present situation of the Church in America makes certain that a similar problem will not again arise. Long before the death of Herr Cahensly in Coblenz on Christmas Day, 1923,[108] the Church in America had come of age. The wounds of the 1890's were long-since healed. The good work of Cahensly's heart and hands lived still in the emigrant-aid foundations he had established.[109] Whatever his mistakes may have been, his contribution to the spiritual and material welfare of thousands of homeless human beings entitles him to the gratitude of Germans and Americans alike.

JOHN J. MENG

Queens College

[108] P. Beda Kleinschmidt, O.F.M., *Auslanddeutschtum und Kirche. Ein Hand- und Nachschlagebuch auf geschichtlichstatistischer Grundlage* (Münster, 1930), I, 100.

[109] For details concerning the work of the St.-Raphaels Verein in the United States, and additional information on the life and interests of Cahensly, cf. *Festschrift zum silbernen Jubiläum des Leo-Hauses* (New York, 1914).

MISCELLANY

A Guide to the Baltimore Cathedral Archives

No research student of American Catholic history has worked very long in the field without becoming aware of the riches contained in what has come to be familiarly known as the Baltimore Cathedral Archives. To date no guide to these archives has been available. During the past summer the writer followed the course in the preservation and administration of archives given at the National Archives under the direction of Dr. Ernst Posner and members of the National Archives staff.[1] The valuable knowledge and practical techniques acquired during the course prompted him to undertake a guide to the Baltimore Cathedral Archives in the hope that it might be of service to students interested in one of the principal depositories of source materials for American Catholic history.

The importance of the Baltimore collection is such that all research workers recognize it as ranking first among the archives of the Catholic Church in the United States. The reasons for its pre-eminence are, of course, due to the history and character of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Baltimore. The Diocese of Baltimore was erected on November 6, 1789, by Pope Pius VI as the first diocese of the United States, and it had as its area of jurisdiction the entire country. For over eighteen years the limits of the diocese were coterminus with those of the United States, which meant that the correspondence affecting the life of the Church throughout the whole Republic found its way to Baltimore. On April 8, 1808, Pope Pius VII raised the original diocese to the rank of Archdiocese of Baltimore and created at the same time four suffragan sees at Bardstown, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. However, Baltimore remained the single metropolitan see in the United States until the erection of the Archdiocese of Oregon City on July 24, 1846. Even after that time, and with the gradual addition of other metropolitan sees, Baltimore remained the ecclesiastical capital of Catholic America. In Baltimore were held the seven provincial councils between 1829 and 1849, and in Baltimore, too, were held the three plenary councils of the American Church in 1852, 1866, and 1884. Moreover, on July 19, 1858, the Congregation of the

[1] The writer wishes to thank Joseph M. Nelligan, chancellor of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington, Peter Guilday, professor of American church history in the Catholic University of America, Ernst Posner, professor of history and archival administration in the American University, and Oliver W. Holmes, program adviser to the Archivist of the United States, for their kindness in reading the manuscript and offering many helpful criticisms and suggestions.

Propaganda issued a decree which conferred on the Archdiocese of Baltimore the privilege of "prerogative of place." By virtue of this decree the Archbishop of Baltimore takes precedence in councils, gatherings, and meetings of the American hierarchy over all other archbishops of the United States (except cardinals), regardless of the date of their consecration.

By reason of the special position of the see, therefore, the archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore came to have an importance far beyond that of the ordinary American diocese. Another factor which enhanced the value of its records was that for nearly a half century the archdiocese was presided over by James Cardinal Gibbons (1877-1921) whose unique career gave added value to the accumulation of archival materials in Baltimore. The fact that the District of Columbia was created as the Archdiocese of Washington by Pope Pius XII on July 22, 1939, did not alter the position of the records to any extent since the two archdioceses have remained united "aeque principaliter" under the one archbishop with the one curia centered in Baltimore. With three exceptions the archdiocesan offices are all in Baltimore. These exceptions are the Matrimonial Court, the Catholic Charities, and the *Catholic Review*, all of which maintain Washington offices as well as offices in Baltimore, although no permanent records of the Matrimonial Court and the *Catholic Review* are kept in Washington. With the addition of new dioceses, the Archdiocese of Baltimore was gradually reduced in size from the entire United States (1789-1808) until by the erection of the Diocese of Wilmington on March 3, 1868, it was confined to the counties of the State of Maryland lying west of the Chesapeake Bay and the District of Columbia. In 1939, as mentioned above, the federal district was constituted a separate archdiocese. During the period of 157 years since the See of Baltimore was established it has been presided over by ten archbishops as follows:

John Carroll 1789-1815
Leonard Neale 1815-1817
Ambrose Maréchal 1817-1828
James Whitfield 1828-1834
Samuel Eccleston 1834-1851
Francis Patrick Kenrick 1851-1863
Martin John Spalding 1864-1872
James Roosevelt Bayley 1872-1877
James Gibbons 1877-1921
Michael J. Curley ..... 1921——

In the evolution of American ecclesiastical administration the office of diocesan chancellor has come to occupy a leading role, and the importance of the chancery office is, therefore, reflected in the records of every diocese. Not until the First Plenary Council of Baltimore in May, 1852,

was there any general legislation on the need for establishing diocesan chancery offices in the United States. The seventh decree of that council read:

> Visum est Patribus valde expedire ut in unaquaque diocesi Cancellariam statuat ordinarius, pro faciliore rerum ecclesiasticarum administratione, et ad stabilem in iis negotiis agendi normam consequendam.[2]

This legislation of 1852 was not, however, immediately acted upon in many dioceses. It was only in 1858 that the chancery office of the Archdiocese of Baltimore was formally set up and the *Catholic Directory* for 1859 was the first issue of that annual to carry the name of a Baltimore chancellor, in this instance Thomas A. Foley. That other dioceses were slow to implement the legislation of 1852 we know from the fact that in the Second Plenary Council of 1866 the question of diocesan organization was again the subject of legislation, and in the fifth chapter of the title, "De Hierarchia et Regimine Ecclesiae," a full complement of diocesan officials was stressed and "the bishops are urged to make such appointments for the proper administration of diocesan affairs."[3] After 1859 the Archdiocese of Baltimore had an organized chancery office with a chancellor. The names of these officials and the years of their tenure of office were as follows:

Thomas A. Foley	1859-1870
John J. Dougherty	1871-1873
William E. Starr	1874-1881
George W. Devine	1881-1886
M. A. Fenne	1886
Patrick J. Donahue	1886-1892
Cornelius F. Thomas	1892-1895
William A. Reardon	1895-1899
Joseph T. O'Brien	1899-1903
Patrick C. Gavan	1903-1914
Louis R. Stickney	1914-1920
Eugene J. Connelly	1920-1923
William J. Hafey	1923-1926
William E. Mackessy	1926-1935
Joseph M. Nelligan	1935——

[2] *Concilium Plenarium totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae Baltimori habitum anno 1852* (Baltimore, 1853), p. 45.

[3] Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884* (New York, 1932), pp. 204-205. For the text of the pertinent decrees in the council of 1866 cf. *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II . . . Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore, 1868), pp. 53-58.

In the course of years the administrative machinery of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, like all other American dioceses, has been greatly expanded. The consequence is that there are now a considerable number of records-creating agencies in various archdiocesan offices, the records of which will in time become non-current and archival in nature. The reader will find the principal agencies of this kind listed at the end of the guide with a brief description of their holdings. Due to the crowded condition in the archives vault[4] it is not possible at present to take in the non-current records of these archdiocesan agencies; whatever records they have are housed in their respective offices.

There are two finding aids to the materials in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives. For the papers from Archbishop Carroll up to those of Cardinal Gibbons each file box contains a handwritten list of the contents of the box which gives the sender's name, date, letter number, and the number of pages of each document. These lists vary somewhat but for the most part they follow the pattern outlined above. In a few cases the lists are missing from the boxes. The file boxes themselves, for the most part, measure 12x12x3 inches and are numbered from 1 through 136 for the papers of the archbishops from Carroll to Curley with some boxes bearing supplementary numbers in the earlier administrations. The second finding aid is a card index of the documents from Carroll on through the Gibbons administration to January 1, 1904, which was prepared over twenty years ago by Mr. George W. White. The cards in this card index, arranged alphabetically, and chronologically thereunder, for the period from Carroll to Gibbons, give the name of the archbishop in whose administration the letter occurs, the name of the sender, date, letter number, the number of pages of the document, and whether it is autographed, signed, etc. For the period from Archbishop Carroll up to the administration of Cardinal Gibbons, which began in 1877, the index is simply an index and nothing more. It comprises seventeen trays of 3x5 cards. Only occasionally will one find any more information on the index card than the bare facts given above. However, for the period from 1877 to 1904 the cards amount to a calendar, giving all the pertinent data plus a brief description of the document's contents. The index to the records of the Gibbons administration follows a chronological, not an alphabetical, order and for the documents down to 1904 there are presently six trays of 3x5 cards. The orderly arrangement of the unindexed materials in the archives on a chronological basis is now in process, and it is anticipated that as soon as the arrangement has been finished the work of completing the index for all the unindexed papers can be pushed forward.

[4] The vault itself is a concrete, fire-proof structure with entrance leading into the Chancery Office. Its proportions as a small sized room are now nearly outgrown.

The materials in these archives which are naturally of most interest to the historian and research worker are those which date from the earliest years, i.e., from the second half of the eighteenth century down to the death of Cardinal Gibbons in 1921. The writer has endeavored to give brief descriptions of the different series with such information as the terminal dates, number of file boxes or drawers, some notion of their contents, and finally a word on their general arrangement. There has also been included a list of the files of the archdiocesan newspapers, the *Catholic Directory*, books of reference, registers, ledgers, and scrapbooks kept in the archives.

In general the papers of the Archbishops of Baltimore from John Carroll to James Gibbons are divided in the file boxes with labels for three classifications; (a) letters to; (b) letters to and from; (c) administration of. In the case of brief administrations, such as those of Archbishops Neale and Whitfield, this three-way classification has not been maintained, but all the papers of these archbishops have been combined in one classification under "administration of."

Records of the Administration of John Carroll (b. 1735; Prefect Apostolic, 1785; Bishop of Baltimore, 1789; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1808; d. 1815). 16 file boxes and 1 volume.

Letters to Archbishop Carroll, 1786-1815. 10 file boxes. Nos. 1-8B. Arranged alphabetically with lists of letters in each box giving sender's name, date, letter number, and number of pages of each document.

Letters from Archbishop Carroll, 1786-1815. 2 file boxes. Nos. 9-9A. Some of these letters are rough drafts, others apparently originals returned to the archives. Arranged alphabetically with lists as above.

Administration of Archbishop Carroll, 1750-1815. 4 file boxes. Nos. 10-11B. This is both incoming and outgoing correspondence, although mostly the former, and pertains more directly to Carroll's administration of the diocese. However, it is not always clear why it should have been separated from the items described above. Some of the correspondence goes back to matters relating to the colonial properties of the Jesuits in Maryland. Arranged under alphabetical groups with lists of contents in front of the file box.

Letterbook of Archbishop Carroll, August 20, 1799-August 10, 1815. 1 Vol. Fair copies of outgoing letters. Arranged chronologically with an index of names. The volume also contains a list of churches and lots for the Archdiocese of Baltimore, August 18, 1824-October 25, 1862. Cf. Special Boxes A, B, and C and Copybook *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of Leonard Neale (b. 1747; Coadjutor Bishop of Baltimore, 1800; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1815; d. 1817). 2 file boxes and 1 volume.

Administration of Archbishop Neale, 1785-1817. 2 file boxes. Nos. 12-12A. Incoming and outgoing correspondence of Neale as priest, bishop, and second Archbishop of Baltimore. Arranged alphabetically with lists in each box giving data on individual documents.

Letterbook of Archbishops Neale and Maréchal, August 7, 1814-October 13, 1827. 1 Vol. Contains fair copies on Roman business, Harold troubles in Philadelphia, and dispute between Maréchal and the Jesuits. Arranged chronologically; no index. Cf. Special Boxes A, B, and C and Copybook *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of Ambrose Maréchal (b. 1768; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1817; d. 1828). 12 file boxes and 2 volumes.

Letters to Archbishop Maréchal, 1803-1827. 8 file boxes. Nos. 13-20. Arranged alphabetically with lists of contents in each box.

Letters to and from Archbishop Maréchal, 1817-1828. 2 file boxes. Nos. 21-21A. Some letters from Maréchal are originals, others copies. Arranged alphabetically with lists of contents in each box.

Administration of Archbishop Maréchal, 1783-1827. 4 file boxes. Nos. 22-22C. Papers relating to administrative problems of archdiocese, some dating from the question of Jesuit properties in Maryland, Charleston schism, etc. Included as well are notebooks, travel books, etc., of Maréchal. Arranged alphabetically with lists of contents.

Letterbook of Archbishops Neale and Maréchal, August 7, 1814-October 13, 1827. 1 Vol. Cf. *supra* under Neale.

Letterbook of Archbishop Maréchal on Norfolk troubles, July 2, 1817-August 7, 1819. 1 Vol. Fair copies of incoming and outgoing letters on Norfolk schism, Simon Gallagher in Charleston, etc. Arranged chronologically. Cf. Letters to the Archbishops, Special Boxes B and C, and Copybook *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of James Whitfield (b. 1770; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1828; d. 1834). 2 file boxes and 1 volume.

Administration of Archbishop Whitfield, 1807-1834. 2 file boxes. Nos. 23-23A. Incoming and outgoing correspondence, but mostly the former. These papers relate predominantly to Whitfield's administration as archbishop, although there are some personal papers included. Arranged alphabetically with lists of contents in each box.

Letterbook of Archbishop Whitfield, May, 1828-July 27, 1832. 1 Vol. Fair copies of Whitfield's correspondence with Roman officials on various subjects. Arranged chronologically with an index in the back. Cf. Letters to the Archbishops, Special Boxes B and C and Copybook *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of Samuel Eccleston (b. 1801; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1834; d. 1851). 5 file boxes.

Letters to Archbishop Eccleston, 1822-1851. 3 file boxes. Nos. 24-26. Arranged alphabetically with lists of contents in individual boxes; the list in Box No. 25 is missing.

Administration of Archbishop Eccleston, 1824-1851. 2 file boxes. Nos. 27-27A. Incoming and outgoing correspondence, mostly the former, relating to general administrative problems; notes and ms copies of *acta* of provincial councils of 1846 and 1849 and of third synod of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Arranged in alphabetical groups indicated on lists in front of each box. Cf. Letters to the Archbishops, Special Boxes B and C, and Copybook *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of Francis Patrick Kenrick (b. 1796; Coadjutor Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830; Bishop of Philadelphia, 1842; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1851; d. 1863). 7 file boxes and 2 volumes.

Letters to Archbishop Kenrick, 1811-1863. 5 file boxes. Nos. 28-32. Box No. 32 contains six letters from Kenrick, three of which date from 1815. Arranged alphabetically.

Letters to and from Archbishop Kenrick, 1815-1863. 1 file box. No. 32A. These are mostly incoming letters, although there are some outgoing letters which were apparently returned to the archives. Arranged alphabetically.

Administration of Archbishop Kenrick, 1851-1863. 1 file box. No. 32B. Various papers relating to different subjects, e.g., the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Eighth and Ninth Provincial Councils of Baltimore, the American College, Rome, Kenrick's Acta Episcopalia, and some personal papers. Arranged alphabetically with a list of contents.

Letterbook of Archbishop Kenrick, October 10, 1851-October 17, 1862. 1 Vol. Fair copies of some letters from the Congregation of Propaganda to Kenrick, May 31, 1823-May 22, 1851, and a mere register of others. Arranged chronologically; an index of names.

Register of Correspondence of Archbishops Kenrick and Spalding, October 17, 1862-October 19, 1869. 1 Vol. This volume is mostly for Spalding and is in greater part a mere register. Arranged chronologically; an index of names. Cf. Letters to the Archbishops, Special

Boxes B and C, and Copybook *infra* Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of Martin John Spalding (b. 1810; Auxiliary Bishop of Louisville, 1848; Bishop of Louisville, 1850; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1864; d. 1872). 10 file boxes and 4 volumes.

Letters to Archbishop Spalding, 1839-1872. 5 file boxes. Nos. 33-36A. Personal and official correspondence with some wide gaps. There are only a few letters from the earlier years while those of the 1860's and early 1870's are numerous. There are lists in each file box giving details on the individual documents, although some lists do not have the dates. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder.

Letters from Archbishop Spalding, 1831-1871. 1 file box. No. 37. A group of family letters to Spalding is included here, but the majority are from Spalding to Kenrick while the former was Bishop of Louisville, to members of Spalding's family, etc. Arranged in alphabetical groups with list of contents in front of the box.

Administration of Archbishop Spalding, 1830-1872. 4 file boxes. Nos. 38-39B. Both official and personal papers on a wide variety of subjects, e.g., the Second Plenary Council, Vatican Council, American College, Rome, Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore, newspaper clippings, and some letters from Spalding, mostly to members of his family during his student days in Rome dating from 1830. Arranged alphabetically under topics. The lists in the front of these boxes give only general subjects, number of documents, a few names, but no dates.

Register of Correspondence of Archbishops Kenrick and Spalding, October 17, 1862-October 19, 1869. 1 Vol. Cf. *supra* under Kenrick.

Acta Episcopalia of Archbishop Spalding, July 31, 1864-December 11, 1871. 1 Vol. This episcopal diary also contains Spalding's records of visitations of religious houses (monasteries and convents), August 4, 1864-December 16, 1868; a record of his confirmations, September 1, 1864-July 7, 1871; some financial accounts of the archdiocese, August, 1864-May, 1871.

Letterbook of Archbishop Spalding, January 14, 1865-October 18, 1869. 1 Vol. Press copies of outgoing letters preceded by an index of names. Arranged chronologically.

Letterbook of Archbishops Spalding and Gibbons, December 13, 1870-October 14, 1886. 1 Vol. Press copies of outgoing letters; no index. Arranged chronologically. Cf. Letters to the Archbishops, and Special Boxes B and C *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of James Roosevelt Bayley (b. 1814; Bishop of Newark, 1853; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1872; d. 1877). 5 file boxes and 4 volumes.

Letters to and from Archbishop Bayley, 1859-1877. 1 file box. No. 40. Mostly incoming letters, but a few originals of Bayley's returned to the archives. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder. A list of contents in the file box.

Letters to Archbishop Bayley, 1856-1876. 2 file boxes. Nos. 41-42. General correspondence, both official and personal. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder. List of contents for Box 42 is missing.

Administration of Archbishop Bayley, 1843-1877. 2 file boxes. Nos. 43-43A. Although labeled administration, there are a number of family letters included in these files, together with Roman documents, printed and handwritten, and a diary of Bayley's running from October 8, 1872-November 23, 1876. There are a few letters from Bayley to his family and friends from Europe, 1843 ff. Arranged alphabetically with list of contents in Box No 43A; chronological arrangement with only very general listing of contents in Box No. 43.

Diary of James Roosevelt Bayley, January 1, 1842-July 14, 1850. 1 Vol.

Archbishop Bayley's Scrapbook, 1855-1872. 1 Vol. A collection of newspaper clippings assembled during Bayley's time in Newark.

Archbishop Bayley's Diary of a Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, 1867. 1 Vol. partially filled.

Episcopal Diary of Archbishop Bayley, October, 1872-November, 1876. 1 Vol. This diary, covering the same period, is in addition to the one mentioned *supra*.

List of ground rents belonging to the estates of the Archbishops of Baltimore from Kenrick to Gibbons as collected by Alex Yearley & Son, agents, 1871-1878. 1 Vol.

An Examination of the (So-Called) Apostolical Canons by James Roosevelt Bayley, B.A. (no date). Cf. Letters to the Archbishops and Special Box C *infra* under Records of Various Administrations.

Records of the Administration of James Gibbons (b. 1834; Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina, 1868; Bishop of Richmond, 1872; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1877; d. 1921). 92 file boxes and 12 volumes.

General Correspondence, January 1, 1861-January 1, 1904. 30 file Boxes. Nos. 71-100. This correspondence, which is both official and personal, contains for the most part incoming letters, but there are also fair copies of outgoing letters, copies of Gibbons' early sermons, newspaper clippings, and administrative papers as Archbishop of Bal-

timore. Arranged chronologically with each document bearing a number which corresponds to that registered in the card index.[5]

General Correspondence, January 1, 1904-September 2, 1921. 36 file boxes. Nos. 101-136. This correspondence is of the same general character as that described above. It is arranged chronologically, but it is not yet indexed on cards.

Miscellaneous Papers, c. 1871-April, 1921. 26 file boxes. These papers contain a very wide variety of documents including incoming and outgoing correspondence, sermons, reprints, galley sheets of books, newspaper clippings, receipts, cancelled checks, printed papal documents, etc., along with a fairly wide scattering of papers from previous administrations. There is no order of arrangement at present, although these papers are in process of chronological arrangement for indexing.

General Papers, c. 1886-c. 1913. 2 cardboard boxes. These boxes contain incoming correspondence with a few copies of outgoing letters and deal with subjects like the Knights of Labor, Christmas letters to Gibbons from princes and cardinals, Roman rescripts, etc. The papers are wrapped in individual packages within the boxes but there is no order or arrangement.

Letterbook of Archbishops Spalding and Gibbons, December 13, 1870-October 14, 1886. 1 Vol. Cf. *supra* under Spalding.

Diary of Cardinal Gibbons, September 25, 1868-April 28, 1917. 1 Vol.

Original copies of papal bulls and briefs addressed to Gibbons by Popes from Pius IX to Benedict XV, March 3, 1868-June 29, 1920; also some original letters from heads of states to Gibbons. 1 wrapped package of flat material.

Bank books of Cardinal Gibbons in Metropolitan Savings Bank, Baltimore, May 6, 1878-May 29, 1909. 2 notebooks.

Newspaper clippings entitled, "American Journals on the Ceremony of Imposing the Berretta upon Cardinal Gibbons at Baltimore, June 30, 1886." 1 Vol.

Press clippings and reviews of Gibbons' *Our Christian Heritage,* 1889-1890. 1 Vol.

Notes on payment of certain bills by Cardinal Gibbons, 1890-1891. 1 notebook.

James Gibbons, *The Faith of Our Fathers,* 11th rev. ed. (Baltimore, 1879) with the author's marginal notes.

Press clippings of Cardinal Gibbons' Silver Episcopal Jubilee, October 18-19, 1893. 1 Vol.

[5] For a description of the card index cf. *supra* p. 350.

Clippings from Newspaper Account of the Visit of His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons to Central and Western New York, January, 1900. 1 Vol.

Memorandum on notes and loans made by Cardinal Gibbons, March 30, 1909-November 18, 1920. 1 notebook.

Press clippings of the Civic Celebration in Honor of Cardinal Gibbons' Golden Jubilee of His Priesthood, June 6, 1911. Presented by the Staff of the Baltimore *Sun*. 1 Vol.

Printed copies of encyclicals of Popes Leo XIII and Pius X, June 20, 1894-July 18, 1907; and pastoral of the American hierarchy, September 26, 1919. 1 folder.

Photographs of Cardinal Gibbons and other notables. 1 folder.

Records of the Administration of Michael J. Curley (b. 1879; Bishop of St. Augustine, 1914; Archbishop of Baltimore, 1921). 79 file boxes, 8 file drawers, and 2 volumes.

Correspondence, October, 1921-June, 1922. 1 file box. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. No arrangement.

Correspondence, November, 1921-October 25, 1928. 20 file boxes. Incoming correspondence. Arranged chronologically, alphabetically thereunder.

Documents from the Holy See and the Apostolic Delegation, November, 1921-1946. 7 file boxes. Arranged chronologically in folders within the file boxes.

Correspondence, March, 1922-June, 1940. 35 file boxes. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged chronologically, alphabetically thereunder.

Correspondence, August, 1937-December, 1942. 14 file boxes. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically.

Correspondence relating to Archbishop Curley's Episcopal Jubilee, October-November, 1939. 1 file box. Arranged alphabetically.

Correspondence, June 1, 1940——. 1 file drawer. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder.

Episcopal Diary of Archbishop Curley, November 29, 1921——. 2 Vols. This diary has been kept by the successive chancellors of the Archdiocese of Baltimore since 1921.

Newspaper clippings relating to Archbishop Curley's silver jubilee, 1929; Maryland tercentenary, 1934; erection of the Archdiocese of Washington, 1939. 1 cardboard box. Arranged in folders.

Sermons and Addresses of Archbishop Curley, 1921——c. 1930. 1 folder. Copies of public addresses, sermons, and prayers. Arranged in rough chronological order.

Reports on the Catholic University of America, 1922-1925. 1 file box. This file contains the printed or typed copies of minutes of the Board of Trustees, financial reports, reports of committees of the faculty, etc., submitted to Archbishop Curley as chancellor of the University. Arranged in rough alphabetical order. Other University papers and correspondence, 1938 ff., are kept in folders for each year in a file drawer, arranged alphabetically, and labeled "Designated Correspondence."

Records of Various Administrations. 20 file boxes and 9 volumes.

Letters to the Archbishops, Maréchal to Kenrick, from the Congregation of the Propaganda, April 15, 1820-April 20, 1863. 1 file box. No. 32C. This series of letters from the Propaganda is not complete since prior to its assembly many letters had been distributed through other series, the order of which it was not found desirable to alter. Arranged chronologically; the list of contents is missing from this file box.

Letters to Archbishops Spalding and Bayley from the Congregation of the Propaganda, 1863-1874. 1 file box. No. 43B. This series of letters cannot be considered complete for the same reason as given in the item above. Arranged chronologically; the list of contents is missing from this file box.

Special Box A, 1784-1814. The three following file boxes contain documents of special importance or of a confidential nature. The following in this particular box are all addressed to John Carroll: John Ashton letters, December 1, 1874-December 29, 1805; Dennis Cahill letters, January 21, 1798-November 22, 1802; James Griffin letters, September 8, 1804-January 29, 1814; Stephen Theodore Badin letters, December 16, 1800-July 17, 1806. Arranged chronologically with a list of contents in front of the box.

Special Box B, 1784-1871. Papal bulls and briefs running from that of June 6, 1784, granting John Carroll the right of administering confirmation to that of Pius IX, August 2, 1871, acknowledging Archbishop Spalding's congratulations on the Pope's silver pontifical jubilee. They are either originals, authenticated copies, or plain copies. Arranged chronologically with a list of contents in the front of the box.

Special Box C, 1745-1893. These boxes are of a great variety and some are of high importance. In time they extend from a grant of land in Prince George County, Maryland, from Charles Calvert to Thomas Digges, August 1, 1745, to a series of eight letters to February 15, 1893, from Bishop Edward Fitzgerald of Little Rock to Cardinal Gibbons on affairs in the Diocese of Dallas. The box contains, *inter alia*, twenty-three letters of B. U. Campbell to various persons, a handwritten copy of the regulations passed by the American

hierarchy in their meeting of 1810, two letters from Thomas Jefferson to Archbishop Maréchal, four letters from James Madison to Archbishop Carroll, seven letters from John Henry Newman to Archbishops Kenrick and Bayley, five letters from Cardinal Wiseman to Archbishop Kenrick, one letter from William H. Seward to Archbishop Spalding. Arranged in a roughly alphabetical order, chronologically thereunder, with a list of the contents in the front of the box. These three special boxes have individual locks.

Copybook of Documents Received, Archbishops Carroll to Spalding, July 28, 1783-June 11, 1863. 1 Vol. These are mostly Roman documents copied *in toto* relating to the archdiocese; others are a mere calendar or index of outgoing letters. There are both incoming and outgoing letters. Arranged chronologically for the most part, but not strictly so. There is an index.

Miscellaneous Papers, c. 1800-c. 1921. 14 file boxes. These papers are of the widest possible variety running from the time of Archbishop Carroll to the beginning of the administration of Archbishop Curley. They include items on student reports, receipted bills, old sermons, reports on parishes in the archdiocese, plats of church properties, incoming and outgoing correspondence, etc. There is no order or arrangement.

Three photostats of agreement between the Bishop of Baltimore and the superior of the Society of Jesus in the United States entered into with respect to appointments, 1805. 1 folder.

Record of students ordained for the Archdiocese of Baltimore, 1830-1921. 1 Vol.

Last wills and testaments of Martin J. Spalding, Henry S. Coskery, and James Roosevelt Bayley, 1872-1878. 1 Vol.

Reports of Parishes in the Archdiocese of Baltimore, 1873-1920. 3 Vols. These volumes list baptisms, marriages, deaths, receipts, expenditures, debts, improvements, and insurance by annual totals.

Printed circulars and notices to pastors and the people of the Archbishops of Baltimore and their chancellors, February 4, 1886-June 5, 1946. 3 Vols.

Reports on archdiocesan parishes, schools, and societies, 1921. 1 file box. These reports were prepared for Archbishop Curley upon his entry to Baltimore. Arranged in folders within file box but no other order.

Records of the Chancery Office. 101 file boxes, 40 file drawers, and 63 volumes.

Correspondence, 1915-1921. 1 file box. Mostly incoming correspondence on diocesan and interdiocesan affairs. No arrangement.

Secret archives, 1921——. 2 file drawers. Confidential files.

Correspondence on parishes, c. 1921——. 3 file drawers. Arranged alphabetically in folders.

Correspondence in regard to faculties, c. 1921——. 1 file drawer. Arranged alphbetically.

Correspondence on seminaries, c. 1921——. 2 file drawers. Incoming and outgoing correspondence relating to students in seminaries including seminary reports, forms, etc. Arranged alphabetically in folders.

Correspondence, 1925-1935. 18 file boxes. Incoming correspondence with copies of replies attached. Arranged chronologically, alphabetically thereunder.

Correspondence, 1935-1945. 77 file boxes. Incoming correspondence with copies of replies attached. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder.

Correspondence with Apostolic Delegation, August, 1935-December, 1944. 1 file box. Arranged chronologically.

Designated Correspondence, c. 1935——. 5 file drawers. Incoming and outgoing correspondence on a wide variety of subjects. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder in folders.

Correspondence on Catholic Recreational Center, January, 1937——. 4 file boxes. Incoming and outgoing correspondence with financial reports. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder.

Chancery ledger and journal, 1917-1946. 4 Vols. Expenditures and receipts for operating the Chancery Office.

Notitiae of parishes, c. 1873-1945. 7 file drawers. Printed questionnaires concerning population figures, statistics on reception of the sacraments, and financial reports. Arranged alphabetically by parishes in folders.

Records of priests and ecclesiastical students. 7 file drawers. Arranged alphabetically in folder.

Records of investments, c. 1910——. ½ file drawer. Arranged alphabetically in folders.

Records of *sanatio in radice*, c. 1915——. ½ file drawer. Arranged chronologically in folders.

Records of dispensation from banns of marriage, March 2, 1920-December 31, 1936. 5 Vols.

Records of dispensations from banns of marriage, March, 1920——. 30 trays of 3x5 cards. Arranged alphabetically.

Index of dispensations from matrimonial impediments, 1911——. 42 trays of 3x5 cards. Arranged alphabetically.

Matrimonial dispensations, October 12, 1851-October 21, 1935. 54 Vols.

Matrimonial dispensations, promises, and signed marriage agreements, January 1, 1922-October 21, 1935. Nos. 1-26, 120. 59 wrapped packages.

Matrimonial dispensations, October, 1935——. 8 file drawers of flat material.

Last wills and testaments of bishops and priests. 1 file drawer of folded material partially filled.

Insurance policies and deeds to church properties of Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington. 3 file drawers of folded material.

Dispensations from vows, c. 1898——. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically in folders. 1 file drawer.

Records of the Metropolitan Tribunal. 18 file drawers.

Matrimonial Cases, c. 1890-January 26, 1946. 18 file drawers of folded material.

Index to Matrimonial Cases, c. 1890-January, 1946. 4 trays of 3x5 cards. Arranged alphabetically.

Records of the Cathedral of the Assumption. 2 file drawers and 104 volumes.

Correspondence, c. 1942——. 2 file drawers. Arranged alphabetically in folders.

Record of baptisms, St. Peter's Pro-Cathedral, 1782-1827. 5 Vols. One duplicate copy for the years, 1799-1801.

Records of St. Peter's Pro-Cathedral. Marriages, 1783-1795; burials, 1790-1795; baptisms, 1782-1795. 1 Vol.

Register of marriages, 1783-1946. 14 Vols. Vol. V of this series has baptisms and burials as well as marriages.

Register of baptisms, 1812-1946. 12 Vols. There is some overlapping due to copies of original registers from those at St. Mary's Chapel.

Index to baptismal registers, 1782-1843. 2 Vols.

Index to baptisms, 1782-1946. 12 trays of 3x5 cards.

Index to marriage registers. 1 Vol.

Register of deaths and interments, 1793-1923. 5 Vols. There is a gap for the years, 1874-1923.

Minute book of the board of trustees, 1795-1946. 3 Vols.

Records of confraternities: Our Lady of Mount Carmel, 1796-1855; Holy Rosary, 1802-1854; Our Lady of Good Help, 1815-1832. 1 Vol. These records consist of a list of names of the members with dates of their entry into the respective confraternity.

Financial account books, 1817-1818; 1865-1869; 1895-1942. 12 Vols.

Records of pew rents, 1821-1919. 6 Vols. There is a gap in these records for the years, 1871-1891.

Journal of proceedings of the choir, September 18, 1840-March 6, 1942. 1 Vol.

Record of confirmations, 1854-1946. 6 Vols.

Sunday announcements, 1859-1945. 29 Vols.

Minute book of the St. Vincent de Paul Conference, 1864-1928. 2 Vols.

Financial account book of the sanctuary society, 1865-1870. 1 Vol.

Record of first communions, 1871-1892. 1 Vol.

Record of collections for repair of the cathedral, September, 1873-June, 1885. 1 Vol.

Customs of the cathedral, 1889-1901. 1 Vol.

Relief roll and membership list of the St. Vincent de Paul Conference, 1895-1924. 1 Vol.

Notices of the sodality, 1901-1921. 3 Vols.

Catalog of books belonging to the cathedral library. 1 Vol. Arranged alphabetically under subject headings, e.g., history, scripture, etc. No date.

Cathedral plans and specifications. 1 box of flat material.

Appendix: Bound Volumes of Books and Newspapers.

Catholic Mirror. 37 Vols. This weekly newspaper of the Archdiocese of Baltimore began publication on January 5, 1850, under the editorship of Charles I. White. It ended publication in the last half of 1908 under the business managership of William J. DeBlaquiere. The archives possesses a complete run of this paper except for the following years: 1866, 1891, 1898, 1902-1904, and 1908.

Baltimore Catholic Review. 23 Vols. This weekly newspaper of the Archdiocese of Baltimore began publication on November 29, 1913, under the editorship of Cornelius F. Thomas and ran to the issue of April 10, 1936, when its name was changed. The archives has a complete file of this paper.

Catholic Review. 10 Vols. This paper is a continuation of the above with a slightly changed title. The archives has a complete file of the paper with two copies each for Vols. IX-X (1944-1946) during which time the paper has had separate editions for Baltimore and Washington.

Catholic Directory. The archives has copies of the annual volumes of this publication for all the years since 1857 with the exception of the following: 1858, 1860, 1862-1869, 1871-1875, and 1904. The titles and publishers vary.

Bound copy of the letter of George Washington to the Roman Catholics in the United States of America (no date).

Account book of Bohemia Manor plantation, July 1, 1790-December 18, 1796, with an inventory of the plantation and its slaves, April 1, 1802.

Sacra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide ponente l'Emo. e Revmo. Signor Cardinale Fesch. Ristretto della differenze insorte tra l'Archivescovo di Baltimore, ed i PP. Gesuiti di Maryland, e di altri affari concernenti alcune Chiese degli Stati Uniti d'America. (Rome, MDCCCXXII).

Lawsuit between Executors of James Roosevelt, deceased and Union Theological Seminary and James Roosevelt Bayley, Case and Pleadings (New York, 1849). Bound in with this item are several speeches in the House of Representatives on diplomatic relations between the United States and the Holy See (March, 1848); a report of the committee on private land claims of the United States Senate on claims of the Catholic Church in Florida (March 21, 1848); a communication of Governor Hamilton Fish to the New York Legislature enclosing a letter of Bishop John Hughes regarding exchange of diplomatic representatives between the United States and the Papal States (February 13, 1849).

Bound volume of college catalogs of Trinity College, Hartford (1855); Mount Pleasant Classical Institution (1862); Seton Hall College (1861-1862; 1864-1865; 1870).

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii (Baltimore, 1884). 2 copies. The private edition of the acts of the council of 1884.

Collections in the Life of Cardinal Gibbons, edited by John T. Reily. Vols. I-III. (Martinsburg, West Virginia, 1890-1895). The titles vary with each volume.

Press clippings of the Columbian Catholic Congress, Chicago, September, 1893. 1 Vol.

Cathedral Records. From the Beginning of Catholicity in Baltimore to the Present Time, by Michael J Riordan (Baltimore, 1906).

History of the Great National Demonstration held in Baltimore June the Sixth, 1911, in Honor of Cardinal Gibbons to Commemorate the Fiftieth Anniversary of his Priesthood and the Twenty-fifth of his Elevation to the Cardinalate. (Baltimore, 1911). 2 copies.

Acta in Process Non Cultus, Elizabeth Ann Seton, Baltimore, 1914. 1 sealed folder. Cf. Seton item *infra.*

The Life Story of His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons together with an Historical Sketch of the Province of Baltimore, edited by C. F. Thomas (Baltimore, 1917).

Installation Edition. Official Year Book. Archdiocese of Baltimore (Baltimore, 1922). Issued on the occasion of the installation of Archbishop Curley. 2 copies.

Photographs of Pontifical Field Mass at Baltimore Stadium, May 29, 1930. 1 wrapped package.

Records of broadcasts from the Catholic University of America, November 20, 1932, and from the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, May 28, 1933. 1 wrapped package.

Maryland Tercentenary, 1634-1934. An album of essays, historical sketches, and illustrations of Maryland Catholic history presented to Archbishop Curley by the students of St. John's School, Westminster, Maryland.

Newspaper clippings of the death of Pope Pius XI and the election of Pope Pius XII, February-March, 1939. 1 Vol.

Acta in Process Non Cultus, Elizabeth Ann Seton, December, 1940. 1 sealed folder. Cf. Seton item *supra*.

General Information on the Principal Records-Creating Agencies of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington outside of the Archives.

Archdiocesan Clerical Benevolent Association, established in 1857. Office: Long Green Valley Road, Hyde, Maryland.

Donations and legacies given to the Association, 1857-1946. 3 ledgers. There is a gap in these records for the years, 1894-1921.

Correspondence, 1943——. Arranged alphabetically in folders.

Catholic Review, established in 1913. Offices: 21 W. Franklin Street, Baltimore; 1441 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington.

General papers, c. 1934——. c. 50 file drawers. Some incoming and outgoing correspondence, vouchers, cancelled checks, etc. Rough chronological arrangement only.

File of the *Catholic Review*, November 29, 1919——.

No permanent records are kept in the Washington office.

Archdiocesan Catholic Charities, established in 1920. Office: 415 N. Cathedral Street, Baltimore.

Case files of St. Vincent dePaul Society, c. 1910——. 10 file drawers. Arranged alphabetically in folders.

Master file or index of case files. 12 trays of 6x8 cards.

Correspondence, c. 1923——. 9 file drawers of incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically.

Case files of St. Vincent dePaul Society, c. 1910. 10 file drawers. Arranged alphabetically. The records of this agency antedated the formal establishment of the Catholic Charities by about ten years. It is now a subsidiary unit of Catholic Charities.

Archdiocesan Superintendent of Schools, established in 1923. Office: 330 N. Charles Street, Baltimore.

Correspondence, c. 1938——. 2 file drawers. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder in folders.

School supervisors' reports, 1944——. 1 file drawer. Arranged alphabetically according to supervisors' names.

Registration of students, 1933——. 20 file trays of 4x6 cards. Arranged alphabetically by schools.

Archdiocesan Director of the League of the Little Flower for County Schools, established in 1924. Office: 21 W. Franklin Street, Baltimore.

Correspondence, c. 1938——. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically, chronologically thereunder in folders.

Disbursement records for rural parishes, 1924——. Arranged alphabetically in folders according to parishes.

Expenditure records, 1927——. Arranged alphabetically in folders according to parishes.

Financial returns from parishes, 1929——. 2 trays of 3x5 cards.

Membership lists of the League, 1936——. 29 trays of 3x5 cards.

Little Flower, April, 1936-December, 1940. A quarterly booklet issued by the League which gave reports on parish finances of the rural areas, statistics on vacation schools, etc. From the issue of December, 1941, to the present this booklet has appeared as an annual report only.

Archdiocesan Society for the Propagation of the Faith, established in 1925. Office: 415 N. Cathedral Street, Baltimore.

Correspondence, September, 1942——. 13 file drawers. Incoming and outgoing correspondence relating to donations to the society. Arranged alphabetically.

Financial records, March, 1925——. Annual reports on receipts and expenditures, printed yearly.

Membership file, March, 1925——. 10 trays of 3x5 cards for back members and 10 acme files of 12 drawers each for current members.

Council of Catholic Social Clubs of Baltimore, established in 1945. Office: 330 N. Charles Street, Baltimore.

Correspondence, September, 1945——. 3 file drawers partially filled. Incoming and outgoing correspondence. Arranged alphabetically.

Club memberships and public school retreat attendances, September, 1945——. 4 trays of 3x5 cards. Arranged alphabetically.

The subject of ecclesiastical archives found a place in the new code of canon law published by the Holy See in 1918 where it is covered in canons 375-384. A handy volume which summarizes the historical development

of the legislation of the Catholic Church on archives is William F Louis' *Diocesan Archives* (Washington, 1941). The student interested in using the materials of the Baltimore Cathedral Archives for research purposes should make application in writing to the chancellor of the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington, the Right Reverend Joseph M. Nelligan, 408 N. Charles Street, Baltimore 1, Maryland.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Religion in the Struggle for Power. A Study in the Sociology of Religion. By J. MILTON YINGER. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1946. Pp. xix, 275. $3.00.)

This is a highly serious but very confused book. It is "an attempt to study religion empirically as a factor in interhuman behavior" (p. vii). The author disclaims any attempt to "discover the 'essence' of religion," but takes "religion as a factor 'given' to experience" (p. 3). Then, following Troeltsch, he classifies all religious groups into two main types according to their reaction to dominant ethical trends in society. The "church-type (Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian, etc.) tend to compromise their principles and adapt their ethical requirements to the dominant standards of any age. The "sect-type" (Quakers, Mennonites, Jehovah's Witnesses, etc.), on the contrary, tend to resist the prevailing degeneration of the age, but suffer loss of membership on that account. The result is that the "churches" retain a universal appeal and a certain modified effectiveness at the expense of their original principles. The "sects" retain their ethical principles intact but lose ground numerically or tend to withdraw from the general society.

After stating his theory (or Troeltsch's), Dr. Yinger applies it to three special cases. First, he investigates "Calvinism and the Rise of Capitalism" in the footsteps of Weber and Tawney. Briefly summarizing their thesis that Calvinism reversed the traditional Christian attitude towards money-making and created a religious "vocation" for the businessman, he concludes that "one acquainted with the theory of the behavior of religious groups would have been able to predict that if the businessman were coming into an age of power, religious doctrine would soon sponsor him" (p. 128). So it was no surprise at all. But we are warned that "this is not a cynical statement (decrying the inconstancy of religious teachings), for once again we must recall the dilemma of the churches: only by such sponsorship could they begin to control the behavior of this powerful group" (p. 128).

His second case of the working out of this "dilemma" is in relation to the "Economic Ethics of Contemporary Churches," which is explained as an effort "to analyze sociologically some phases of the response of religious groups to 'late' capitalism, to the labor movement, and to socialism" (p. 129). It seems that industrialism, labor movements, and socialism were all well under way when the "churches" felt it was safe to approve them and to patronize them. The "sects," on the other hand, multiplied among the poorer people who were outraged by the association of the "churches" with the rising wealth of the industrialists.

The third great "dilemma" is the case of "The Churches and War." The Protestant churches in the United States are represented as being uniformly and outspokenly pacifist after World War I. But when World War II became an actuality for the United States they acted as a "church" should act and found a way of canonizing the war. The "sects" naturally retained their pacificism. The Catholic Church in the United States, guided by James M. Gillis, C.S.P., was anti-war at first for a large number of complicated motives: the Irish opposition to England, the alliance with Russia, the entrance of the "mother country" (Italy!) on the side of Germany, and so forth (p. 192). But the Thomist doctrine of a just war, overlooked up to this point, enabled the Catholics to rectify all this after we got into the war.

As this is a volume of the Sociological Series of the Duke University Press, it is surprising that the editors could overlook two references to "Bishops Ozanam and Ketteler of Germany" (p. 144). But after that, we are not surprised to learn, on the authority of *Time*, that the Vatican was negotiating a concordat with Germany in the summer of 1940 (pp. 193-4), that the Church may some day accept Modernism as orthodoxy "if it proves to be important to any large number of constituents" (p. 43), that she may be ready "if necessity arise, to baptize Marx as they once baptized Aristotle" (quoting Sidney Hook, p. 44), and that the Church would have no difficulty in swallowing the "atheism" in Russian communism if only it could eliminate the real dilemma of the "class struggle" (p. 152). The happy result of all this is that "today, with the Comitern dissolved, we are beginning to see some kind of reconciliation between the Vatican and Moscow" (p. 152).

These and other remarks seem to reveal a certain unintentional bias. Their lighthearted character may be estimated from the frequency with which the periodical *Time* is introduced as a source of information. And in this regard the author himself is very helpful, warning his readers several times not to make the easy assumption that the Catholic Church forms her policies out of mere hypocrisy (note 35 on page 255, and note 61 on page 236, among others). But surely in an age of liberalism a reader should be left free to draw his own conclusions.

FRANCIS X. GLIMM

Seminary of the Immaculate Conception
Huntington, New York

St. Paul: Apostle and Martyr. By IGINO GIORDANI. Translated from the Italian by Mother Clelia Maranzana and Mother Mary Paula Williamson. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1946. Pp. xviii, 286. $2.50.)

This book reveals its author as an ardent disciple of Catholic Action. This fact aids the reviewer immediately to fix its *genre*. It is designed

"to inspire some readers who have not yet done so, to study for themselves, and in the letters themselves, St. Paul" (p. xiii). It is, therefore, a people's life of St. Paul, and as such it is to be evaluated here. There is a foreword by Archbishop Cushing of Boston that reveals an enthusiasm for the cause of Catholic Action as ardent as the author's. The author is editor of *Il Quotidiano,* head of the staff of the library school, Vatican Library, author of the trilogy *Social Message of Jesus, Social Message of the Apostles,* and the *Social Message of the Early Fathers.*

The basis of this sort of work must be a thorough acquaintance with the field, but not necessarily a specialist's equipment. The presentation of data requires discriminate stress and highlighting of values, rather than a dry factual resumé. It requires drama in the situations, description in the settings, and concise bits of information on sites, cities, and people. These the reviewer considers minimal requirements in a book of this type. Further, from the viewpoint of bookmaking, a map is essential, a few photographic illustrations desired, and a brief follow-up bibliography in order.

By these standards the reviewer evaluates the book. It reveals a rather thorough acquaintance with the field. An illustration will serve: Paul visits Corinth briefly from Ephesus after I Corinthians (canonical), pens a letter on his return to Ephesus, which would be the *intermediary* letter of the Exegetes, either lost, or to be found in our canonical II Corinthians. Although conjectural, this shows a rather intimate knowledge of the problems. Of North Galatia he says, "it is most certain Paul went there" (p. 42). This could be more conservatively phrased in light of present opinion. In the matter of emphasis the reviewer sees two shortcomings: the law of Moses as contained in the Pentateuch is not sufficiently distinguished from the oral pharisaic interpretations and casuistry as the normative force in Judaism, and stress is not put on the fact that the influence of Old Testament prophecy upon pharisaic Judaism was practically nil. As to drama, description, and parcelled erudition the book is least attractive. In retelling the history of *Acts* the narrative is bald; this makes reading tedious. It is inevitable to compare it in this respect with the recent English translation of Holzner's German work, *Paul of Tarsus,* which succeeds so admirably in these matters. Lastly, there are no maps, no illustrations, and no bibliography.

The reviewer found those parts of the book most attractive in which the Epistles are treated. The summations are concise and good. A little more citation of pregnant lines of Paul would have helped. The chapter on Paul and Seneca is altogether excellent.

On the whole the translation is satisfactory. Only in a few places does the reader become translation-conscious; here the idiom has evaded control. The work achieves the objective defined above with reasonable

success, and should serve to introduce many to one of the greatest personalities of history.

JOHN J. DOUGHERTY

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington

ALLESANDRO VALIGNANO, S.J., *Historia del principio y progresso de la Compañía de Jesús en las Indias Orientales (1542-64)*. Herausgegeben und erläutert von Josef Wicki. (Roma: Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.J. 1944. Pp. 108, 510.)

During the last few decades we have witnessed a growing interest in Far Eastern-Occidental relations and particularly in the history of the early Christian missions in Asia. There has been a noticeable increase in studies and monographs dealing with Far Eastern mission history and missiology. Many of these publications are based, almost exclusively, on reports received from the early missionaries, the *Annual Letters* of the Jesuits and the periodic reports sent to Rome, Portugal, and Spain by the Franciscan and Dominican friars.

The *Annual Letters* are, perhaps, the most frequently quoted source. They were annual reports written either by the superior or other members of the mission staff who combined practical experience in the mission field with a thorough training in letters, a keen mind, and the gift of observation. These letters have justly been recognized as valuable historical source material. Unfortunately, however, their value has been somewhat impaired by the great number of uncritical and unreliable editions, whose number is legion and whose historical worth is comparatively slight. The reason, briefly, is this. They were published, primarily, for the sake of "edification" and of arousing interest in the newly-opened mission fields. Anything unedifying, consequently, was omitted; lengthy explanations and dry discussions were shortened or left out, other passages modified, "corrected," and at times even considerably lengthened. The editors often sacrificed accuracy and literalness to style and oratory, and the many translations in German, French, Italian, and the like, took further liberties with the text. Only rarely are these printed editions literal reproductions of the originals.

Many of the standard works on the mission history of the Indies draw heavily on these uncritical editions, and many of our historical writings, consequently, will have to be revised in the light of the original letters or other contemporary records that were not tampered with.

The volume under review is such a contemporary record. It is the work of Alessandro Valignano, S.J., who, next to St Francis Xavier, was perhaps the greatest organizer of the missions in the Far East. In 1573, at

the early age of thirty-five, he was made visitor of the far-flung missions "in universa India Orientali," a position he kept, with a brief interruption, to the end of his life in 1606, at least with regard to Japan and China. He was undoubtedly one of the best informed men in mission matters of the Far East.

Soon after his arrival in India in 1574, Valignano undertook by order of the father general in Rome to write a history of the Jesuit missions in India and the Far East, a work he finished not later than 1583. It consists of two parts, of which the first is preserved only in the Spanish translation of the original Portugese text. The manuscript is contained in the Roman archives of the Society of Jesus (marked *Jap.-Sin.* 49 and 67) and is now published for the first time, the first part in Spanish, the second in the original Portuguese.

After a short introduction regarding the occasion of the work, Valignano deals in thirty rather short chapters with the life, journeys, and work of St. Francis Xavier. This part reads almost like a biography of the saint with emphasis, however, on the historical development of the mission. He bases his account mainly on Father Manuel Texeira's *Vida del bienaventurado Padre Francisco Xavier* (cf. *Monumenta Xaveriana,* II, 815 ff.), but is much more critical than Texeira, especially as regards the miracle accounts. Valignano made it a special point to interrogate the still living contemporaries of Xavier in an attempt to eliminate some of the glaring discrepancies in the different writings about the saint. He furthermore devoted two of the thirty chapters to the customs and religion of the people of India, three to those of the Japanese, and three to those of the Chinese.

In the second part the author deals with the continuation and further development of the missionary work from 1552, the year of the death of Xavier, down to 1564. This part, from the viewpoint of the history of the Society of Jesus, is even more important and interesting than the first. It deals at length with the different mission fields in the East Indies, India, Japan, the Moluccas, and Abyssinia in Africa. We learn about the different religious superiors, provincials and rectors, and thus indirectly about the government of the Society in the foreign missions and about the almost insurmountable difficulties. There are a great many interesting details about conditions in Ormuz (Persian Gulf), on the Maldive Islands (southwest of India), among the Thomas Christians in the southern part of India, and among the Kaffirs in South Africa. Some of the chapters throw an interesting sidelight on the political and economic power of the Portuguese in the Indies, on the social work of the missionaries, and on many other questions of missiological and social import. Of special interest are a number of necrologies of the more outstanding pioneer missionaries. In short, the *Historia* by Valignano contains much new infor-

mation nowhere else obtainable and is indispensable not just to the historian of the Society of Jesus, but to every missiologist and church historian.

The editing by Father Wicki is scholarly and in conformity with the best historical methods. His introduction, copious footnotes, and annotations are clear and always to the point. They obviously embody many years of tireless research. In his long introduction, a valuable monograph in itself, he deals at length with the history of the mission literature of the Jesuits, their first attempts at a mission history, and the life and work of Valignano. Next he describes the manuscript, gives a short synopsis of its contents, and investigates at great length questions regarding the authorship (Valignano or Texeira), the time of the writing, the sources Valignano consulted, the criteria which guided him in his compilation, and finally the influence this manuscript work had on later historians. There are excellent indices. In brief, the edition is worthy of its author and of the Historical Institute of the Society of Jesus in Rome. We only wish that Father Wicki could find time, and the finances, to edit likewise Valignano's history of the Japanese mission, the *Libro primero del principio y progresso de la religion christiana en Japan (1549-1570)*.

GUSTAV VOSS

University of San Francisco

Mother of Carmel. A Portrait of St. Teresa of Jesus. By E. ALLISON PEERS. (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co. 1946. Pp. xi, 220. $2.50.)

That a better understanding of Spanish civilization during the sixteenth century is finding its expression in current literature on Spanish history cannot be questioned. Slowly but surely the prejudices of a century and more ago, fostered by writers like Prescott, Motley, Watson—to mention only a few of the more important—are dissolving. Beside the excellent volumes on Spanish political history of the sixteenth century produced by Merriman we ought to place the contributions of Professor Peers to the history of Spanish thought, especially mysticism during the golden age of Spain. For years the public in the English-speaking world has read unsympathetic and, we may add, hostile comments on the really remarkable religious literature of that age. Recently there has been a tendency to apply psychological theories to the religious phenomena of that time in an unconscionable manner, without serious study of all the facts. But such treatment can no longer be tolerated. For now we have readily at hand Professor Peers' excellent translation of the works of St. Teresa, of St. John of the Cross, of selections of other writers, as well as his widely

known treatise, *Studies of the Spanish Mystics* (in two volumes, London, 1927-30).

This pleasing little book on St. Teresa surely is one of the best ever devoted to that great-souled woman. She, indeed, trod the *via mystica* with all the fiery energy that possessed her soul, but she never lost sight of the practical religious needs of her fellow sisters. Her busy coming and going in founding the houses of the Discalced Carmelites, her many trials with all kinds of people, her physical infirmities, and her masterly writings are discussed with fine understanding. The short reviews of her *Way of Perfection, Interior Castle, Letters, Life, Foundations,* and *Relations* will prove helpful, especially to beginners. Here and there the author gives a pleasing glimpse of this exceedingly human woman, and also of some others like the spirited eleven-year-old Casilda de Padilla, who, against the wishes of her relatives and her betrothed, sought admission to one of the convents.

The readers should not lay down this book without perusing the author's *Spirit of Flame* (published by the same company in 1945) which deals with St. John of the Cross, who so intimately assisted St. Teresa in the founding of the Reformed Carmel. His life, further important, as it was devoted to the whole-hearted pursuit of mysticism which he expressed in the rarest poetic splendor, is a natural complement to that of St. Teresa.

HENRY S. LUCAS

University of Washington

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church. By E. CLOWES CHORLEY, Historiographer of the Church. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1946. Pp. ix, 541. $4.00.)

This is the latest volume of the Hale Lecture Series. It is the story of personalities who were party leaders in the Episcopal Church since the Revolution, told for a great part in their own words. It is accurate and utterly impartial. It is one of the best books about American Anglicanism, especially as it makes discriminating use of everything that has yet been written on the subject.

It frankly deals with an enigma. What is Anglicanism? Is it one of the Protestant sects or is it a historical schism? Does it incline towards Rome or Geneva? There is no direct answer, although the author intends that his readers will see for themselves that the fierce antagonisms that have been characteristic of his church since the days of the Elizabethan settlement (or compromise) are gradually tending towards a comprehensive Christianity that will eventually absorb the scattered forces of Christendom.

The Episcopal Church almost ceased to exist after the Revolution. Even as late as 1830 there was only one communicant to every 400 inhabitants in the United States. At present only one per cent is claimed. It is wonderful to think that so small a body has exerted so much influence. It is due to outstanding personalities and to deep loyalties. And yet, strangely enough these loyalties were rather to movements which were mutually antagonistic than to any definite official standards of belief or practice. The author has chosen well to treat of these movements rather than of the church itself.

The movements can be generally classified as low, high, and broad, representing the Calvinistic Puritanism of the sixteenth century, the reactionary ecclesiasticism of the seventeenth century, and the latitudinarianism of the eighteenth century. The Episcopal Church in this country never ceased to be influenced by the trend of religious opinion in England. The movements did not supplant one another but each had its periods of prominence and desuetude.

The vital religion that existed in America at the time of the Revolution was strongly influenced by the preaching of Wesley who still considered himself an Anglican clergyman. When the Methodists finally broke away a strong party of low churchmen remained loyal to the mother church and were known as evangelicals. These soon found themselves in violent conflict with the early high churchmen led by the friend of Mother Seton, Bishop Hobart, who championed the apostolic succession of the episcopacy and the patristic teachings of the seventeenth-century divines. Both these movements were soon faced by Oxford tractarianism, which they opposed with equal vehemence when they sensed its Romeward tendencies. Newman's conversion justified them and tractarianism was rooted out mercilessly. In a few years the Oxford Movement revived under Pusey, and a corresponding anti-Roman party under the leadership of Bishop Hopkins was formed in America, which the author calls the early Catholic movement. It undertook the work of spreading Episcopalianism throughout the newly-opened Northwest territories and its influence has remained to the present day where high churchmanship predominates. Meanwhile the broad or non-dogmatic party was gaining strength. It profited by the constant conflict of low and high churchmen by professing to have no partisan badges, and to be concerned with the adjustment of religion to the social needs of humanity.

After the Civil War, which did not divide the Episcopal Church officially, the old high church party was replaced by the Anglo-Catholics, who claimed that they represented the continuation of the mediaeval church. Their interest in reviving Catholic ceremonial led to the ritual movement in which most of them took part. To this revival an acrimonious reaction set in on the part of the low churchmen, separated, somewhat whimsically,

by the author, from the evangelicals. In the battle which was carried to the judicial courts, both ecclesiastical and civil, the Anglo-Catholics won a sweeping victory, the most determined of the low churchmen under Bishop Cheny going into schism as the Reformed Episcopal Church.

It now seemed as if the Anglo-Catholics were destined to dominate the Episcopal Church, but they were soon faced with the liberal Catholic movement whose leader in England was Bishop Gore. This movement attracted all those who were influenced by modernism. Broad churchmen, evangelicals, and high churchmen agreed to tolerate their differences in an effort to unite Christendom. The basis of union was to be episcopacy, the creeds, and the scriptures. They stampeded the general convention of 1907 and as a gesture of friendliness opened the pulpits of the Episcopal Church to ministers of other denominations. The immediate result was the conversion of William McGarvey and twenty Episcopal clergymen to the Catholic Church.

Since 1907 the increasing tendency towards religious comprehensiveness has been marked. The widest range of beliefs and practices are tolerated. Trials for heresy have ceased. The author, with apparent complacency notes the passing of belief in the doctrine of the fall, the taint of Adam, the vicarious atonement, the eternity of punishment and in the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture. He assures us that Anglicanism is providing a new basis of agreement. Authority is to be found in corporate Christian experience rather than in an infallible church or an infallible Bible.

The opposition to this theory of authority, he tells us, will only come from small groups, particularly from those who are still hoping for corporate reunion with the Greek or Roman Churches.

This book is invaluable to all those who are interested in the Episcopal Church and also in the present trend toward Protestant reunion.

EDWARD HAWKS

St. Joan of Arc Rectory
Philadelphia

The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America. By JOHN TRACY ELLIS, Associate Professor of American Church History in the Catholic University of America. (Washington: American Catholic Historical Association. 1946. Pp. xiv, 415. $3.00.)

Dr. Ellis presents in this attractively written book the story of the birth of an institution which has meant much to the growth of Catholic education in the United States. It is strictly a historical monograph, not a laudatory essay, written from the sources which have been investigated thoroughly and evaluated soundly.

Since the Catholic University of America only recently celebrated the

fiftieth anniversary of its foundation, the source material is relatively abundant and the interpretations not likely to be obscured by misunderstandings and prejudices. Certainly, Dr Ellis has been thoroughly objective and scholarly in his approach to the material, with the result that his study exhibits all the characteristics of an authoritative work.

The growth of the idea of a Catholic university, from its beginnings to its actual inauguration, is traced mainly through the ideas of the American hierarchy responsible for the establishment as they were expressed in letters, articles, and public addresses. In the beginning, and almost up to the very hour of the opening of the University, there existed a not very comprehensive idea of what a university, as distinct from a seminary or college, should be. The larger idea did emerge finally, and has developed with the growth of the University itself. To many this must appear as a somewhat peculiar mental quirk on the part of several, since a university in the best sense of the word, Johns Hopkins, had been in existence since 1876, and had by 1889 progressed far along the road towards a definite university status, in the modern conception of the term. It had also profoundly influenced other already existing universities in the reformation of their academic structures.

Dr. Ellis does not trace the growth of the University beyond the day of its opening. Perhaps he thinks that the time has not yet arrived for such study. Many would agree that much water must flow under the bridges of the Potomac before a thoroughly scholarly history of the Catholic University of America can be written. A sad aspect of the matter is that much of the source material, necessary for such history, has been lost already. The historian who eventually attempts the task will be handicapped in more ways than one. And the odds are that he will not be too successful, no matter how hard he shall work. Dr. Ellis, however, in the work under review, has written a first class study which does great credit to him and to the institution where he labors.

JAMES H. RYAN
Archbishop of Omaha

GENERAL HISTORY

Historical Change. By LEWIS EINSTEIN. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1946. Pp. 132. $1.25.)

Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography. (New York: Social Science Research Council. 1946. Pp. xi, 177. $1.75.)

The latest addition to Current Problems, the series of slim volumes appearing under the general editorship of Sir Ernest Barker, is that of Dr. Lewis Einstein. Only in the selection of illustrations which, though drawn from various ages, are for the most part of quite recent interest,

can this book be said to deal with current problems in the sense of problems peculiar to contemporary history. The problems it raises are current, but current in the sense that they run through all periods of history, and the author's reflections are universal considerations relating to the varied and intricate human activities that actually constitute history. His thesis is best expressed in his own words: "By whatever avenues it is approached and under whatever shape it is presented, history is always a demonstration of power that is carried out by the medium of continuous change. History necessarily creates change, and the record of human events implies the continuity of change. But power is a substance that is derived from a number of different sources which flow with uneven volume and speed . . ." In sketching the meaning of change as it affects history, Mr. Einstein is really examining these different sources of power, the different ways in which they express themselves and with what different consequences. The power he speaks of is always a human thing; mechanical determinism is not enough to account for change. But neither is brute force; ideas and faith are likewise sources of power. This little book is not a treatise; it is rather a collection of *obiter dicta* on the course of history. General statements predominate, save for the practical examples which are there less as justification for the statements than as illustrations chosen arbitrarily and at random. Judicious observations abound, always stimulating and frequently very penetrating. The book is obviously meant for the general reader but the student of history and the historian, too, will enjoy it and will find in it food for thought.

Theory and Practice in Historical Study is a work of a quite different sort. It is clearly professional in tone, prepared by practitioners treating of their *métier* and intended primarily for fellow scholars. Nevertheless, it might well be recommended to others as evidence of the high seriousness of historians in regard to their work and as an index of the problems that stir them so deeply at present; one ought, perhaps, to say an index of the state of their conscience at the moment, for much of the report is in very truth an examination of conscience. The title of Charles A. Beard's introductory essay is significant: "Grounds for a Reconsideration of Historiography." There are reasons to justify such a reconsideration at any time, but the widespread and tumultuous crisis in thought and learning, as well as in practice, through which the western world has been passing makes it a pressing need today. He suggests a number of questions for historians to put to themselves, but all are subsidiary to one general one: Just what do we do and how? The series of "Propositions" that appears further along in the volume is really an attempt to answer this question. It consists of twenty-one fundamental propositions on the nature of history and historiography. Interesting as they are in themselves, they gain considerably from the story of their genesis as recounted by Professor Merle Curti in his general foreword; for they are the result of statements pro-

posed, discussed, criticized, and modified by the committee and then completely revised to take into account the criticisms and comments of seventy competent historians to whom they had been meanwhile submitted. The sober simplicity of these apparently elementary propositions in their present form gives no inkling of the time, thought, and serious discussion devoted to them.

In a survey of the major influences that have affected the study and writing of American history in the last three-quarters of a century, Professor Randall of Columbia and Professor Haines of Connecticut College demonstrate how increased historical knowledge and the actual history through which we live both influence "controlling assumptions" in the interpretation of history. Professor Harold K. Beale of the University of North Carolina then contributes a highly original case-study of historians' efforts to explain the coming of the American Civil War. He is not concerned with the causes of the war as such, but with what can be gathered about writers and the writing of history from a painstaking analysis of one concise block of historical literature on a carefully limited topic. The results, tabulated in the last pages of the article, are most enlightening. Any attempt to resume them further would fail completely to do them justice; suffice it to say that they reveal a variety of attitudes towards the actual conflict itself and towards causation in general which confirms the opinion expressed elsewhere in the report that few historians, even the most "scientific," achieve objectivity, if by objectivity is meant freedom from all-controlling assumptions. Perhaps the highest degree of objectivity is attained by being intelligently and critically aware of one's assumptions.

Professor Sydney Hook's definitions of some fifty primary terms in historical writing bear witness to the committee's preoccupation with the difficult problem of terminology. It is hardly to be expected that everyone would subscribe to definitions formulated by a single man, but no one will study this list of definitions without being made conscious of the grave problem involved in terminology and the need for greater precision; and this undoubtedly was the chief aim of the committee and of Professor Hook.

A selective reading list, twenty pages in length, on historiography, the philosophy of history, and allied matters concludes the volume. It should prove extremely useful. Indeed, the whole volume is to be earnestly recommended, especially to those who are concerned about the actual state of those matters indicated in the title: the theory and practice of historical study.

GEORGE B. FLAHIFF

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Toronto

A History of Western Philosophy. By BERTRAND RUSSELL. (New York: Simon and Schuster. 1945. Pp. xxiii, 895. $5.00.)

The sub-title of this large volume indicates that western philosophy will be treated in "its connection with political and social circumstances from the earliest times to the present day." This would make the work particularly valuable to the general historian if the writer were actually to achieve his aim. The editors of this *Review* are known to be particularly on the lookout for just such histories of various fields, for such service as these latter may render to history in the broader sense. But it can hardly be said that Lord Russell fulfills his highly interesting purpose. In the first place it is an extremely ambitious plan that he proposes when it takes in the whole of western philosophy. As a professional philosopher Lord Russell is considered to be a distinguished mathematician. Secondly, he has never devoted himself to the difficult field of the history of philosophy. The present volume shows his evident lack of training in this regard. Finally, his enormous bias, indeed hatred, of everything Christian makes him peculiarly unfitted to write a history of philosophy where Christian viewpoints have been so influential. This is particularly evident in the second book of his work which he calls "Catholic Philosophy." It is filled with cheap wit, sneers, pretenses of pious acceptance, all written very evidently with an eye to the gallery. Of scholarship there is not the slightest evidence. There is little acquaintance with important primary sources. Needless to say the definitely third-rate performance reaches its nadir in the ten pages devoted to St. Thomas Aquinas. It would be hard to find in such a short space more complete misrepresentation. By giving a supposed abstract of the *Summa Contra Gentiles,* which Russell says is the most important work of St. Thomas, we are supposed to have the substance of Thomism. By the selection of relatively unimportant details of the work the author's chief objective, that of ridiculing what he does not understand, is attained. It is a very cheap victory of a very small mind.

Russell is somewhat more successful in the first book on ancient philosophy and the third on modern philosophy. His method of omitting altogether, with few exceptions, men who do not seem to deserve a fairly full treatment is commendable from the general reader's point of view. To get all the philosophers into a work by giving very short accounts of them conveys, as Russell observes, nothing of value to the reader. In the modern section professing to bring western philosophy up to the present day, only Bergson, William James, and John Dewey are considered. In view of his own interests, Russell brings consideration of contemporary thought to a close with a brief essay on the philosophy of logical analysis.

The author says of his own aim: "My purpose is to exhibit philosophy as an integral part of the social and political life: not as the isolated speculations of remarkable individuals, but as both an effect and a cause

of the character of the various communities in which different systems flourished." Unfortunately, he gives little evidence of being sufficiently familiar with the general history which would make the comprehension of the philosophers in relation to their times more evident. Add to this his frequent failure to grasp the importance of the philosopher's work in its essential features and you have the reason why Russell's most laudable purpose is not accomplished in any worthwhile degree. A history of western philosophy from the viewpoint indicated would be highly serviceable to the general historian. Russell has a good idea but he is not equipped to realize it, as witness this second-rate performance.

CHARLES A. HART
The Catholic University of America

Woman as Force in History. A Study in Traditions and Reality. By MARY R. BEARD. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1946. Pp. viii, 369. $3.50.)

Mary R. Beard has long been a stimulating force in the study and writing of the role of women in civilization. Among her earlier books on the general theme are *Women's Work in Municipalities* (1915), *On Understanding Women* (1931), a survey of the role of women in the process of civilization from earliest to contemporary times, and *America through Women's Eyes* (1933), a collection of extracts from letters, journals, and books written by American women, illustrating women's share in the development of American civilization. Her most recent contribution, *Women as Force in History,* subtitled *A Study in Traditions and Realities,* is an examination of the tradition that throughout history women have been members of a subject sex. An introductory chapter considers three contemporary views of women's place in society: (1) equality with men (communism); (2) domesticity and child-bearing (fascism); (3) right of choice of a way of life (democracy). From attitudes expressed by men and women in various fields, Mrs. Beard points out survivals of the conventional view of women as negligible or nothing or helplessly subject to men in the long past—this despite the useful labors of the social historians and some monographs on specific phases of ideas and activities in history.

The thesis of women's historic subjection to man Mrs. Beard finds grounded in the belief in Blackstone's dictum that woman was civilly dead after she married, that her personality was merged into that of her husband and lord. Blackstone's selective jurisprudence and his superficial and misleading treatment of equity led to the acceptance of the idea of subjection as the whole truth. Elaborations of the doctrines of Blackstone by American feminists, by John Stuart Mill, and by Marxian socialists produced revised versions near the middle of the nineteenth century. Although the movement to bring equity doctrines into statutory law had made sweeping

advances, the Declaration of Sentiments at the Seneca Falls Convention (1848) accepted historic subjection to man as a fact and declared equality with man to be the goal of women's ambitions.

The remainder of the book tests the tradition by reference to historic realities. A review of English history prior to 1765 leads to the conclusion that although there were discriminations, these do not add up to utter subjection of women at law, to say nothing of practice. On the basis of a survey of "long" history Mrs. Beard asserts that the evidence indicates that from modern times running back into and through the mediaeval ages of western feudalism and Christian contests with barbarism, the force of women was a powerful factor in all the infamies, tyrannies, liberties, activities, and aspirations that constituted the history of this stage of humanity's self-expression. An understanding of women's past history Mrs. Beard regards as indispensable to the maintenance and promotion of civilization in the present age.

Mrs. Beard's work is a synthesis, not a monograph based on original sources. For the most part the references in the body of the volume are to secondary materials, as Jolowicz on Roman law, Maitland on early English law, Henry Adams and Coulton on the Middle Ages. While the format and lack of documentation indicate that the book is intended as a treatise for the general trade, yet the preponderance of legal material, the lengthy quotations, and the weight of detail do not make for popular appeal. The book will, however, be stimulating and suggestive to historians and sociologists, lay and professional. Catholic readers will question some words and expressions. For example, the characterization of devotion to Mary as "mother tradition" occurring earlier in the worship of Demeter, Ceres, and Isis, the implication that the priests tried to crush the "mother tradition" in favor of the authority of the Father God and His Son, the treatment of the conflict between the "mystics" and the "speculative theologians." They will, however, appreciate the impetus which Mrs. Beard has given to the study of woman as a force in all periods of history. In view of the urgent need for the participation of women in contemporary activities they will applaud Mrs. Beard's contention that this is not a woman question alone; it is a human problem.

ANNA T. SHEEDY

College of New Rochelle

A Short History of the Far East. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. D. Willis James Professor of Missions and Oriental History and Fellow of Berkeley College, Yale University. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1946. Pp. xiv, 665. $4.75.)

This book admirably attains its purpose "to provide an introduction to the contemporary Far East" for "thoughtful, educated Americans who

have no previous contact with the region and who desire such a survey as will give them background for an understanding of the peoples, the cultures, and the current problems of that area."

The first of its two parts, "Pre-Occidental South and East Asia," opens with a geographical portrayal of the physical aspects which profoundly influenced the history and present problems of the Far East. After a well-proportioned chapter devoted to the geography, history, and culture of pre-British India which exerted a lasting effect upon the far eastern lands, three chapters deal skillfully with ancient China, imperial China to the nineteenth century, and Chinese civilization on the eve of the changes wrought by the West. The development of Japan from the beginning to the advent of Perry and the culture of old Japan are masterfully presented in the next two chapters. Much knowledge and a good sense of values are condensed in the final chapter of the first part on the "Lesser Lands of Northeast and Southeast Asia."

The second part, "India and the Far East in Revolution," deals with east Asia under the impact of white imperialism and exploitation. After a good analysis of India under British conquest and administration, and of its prodromes of emancipation, white rule in the lesser lands of southeast Asia is further analyzed. This is followed by an account of the heightened impact of the West on China from the disgraceful "opium war" waged by England to the inception of China's cultural revolution (1893). Emergent Japan (1853-1893) is the topic of another well planned chapter. The next two chapters expand on the progressive transformation of China and the rise of Japan as a world power (1894-1930). This is followed by a presentation of events in the Far East and India since the beginning of the world struggle in 1931, and is concluded with a retrospective view of a long series of achievements and failures. Each of the seventeen chapters concludes with a clear and helpful summary and a selected bibliography. The value of the book is further enhanced by six maps and a good index.

The author's long experience in the Far East and his extensive teaching and writing about it make him particularly fitted to produce this scholarly outline of the Far East, in which he has succeeded in catching the soul of the lands, people, and cultures of the region in all phases of their diversified lives from material cultures to religion and foreign missions, rather than in presenting a tedious sequence of mere facts, names, and dates. At a time when the public is subjected to a flood of ephemeral, biased, and misleading literature—often tainted with yellow, pink, and red views—an intellectually honest interpretation of the Far East like the present volume is most welcome and beneficial.

Because of the extensive scope of the material covered, issue could be taken with certain minor details of the work or the attitudes adopted as,

for instance, where Professor Latourette mentions that the Portugese "brought" rather than re-introduced Catholicism into India (p. 71); his favorable attitude toward the Ch'in dynasty (pp. 95-97), ignoring its extreme barbarism; attributing great influence to Protestant Christianity in the modern period (p. 591), particularly to such as Sun Wen who in truth refrained from professing Christianity for political reasons, or his second wife who actually is a communist; crediting of the Communist Party and army with "formidable" resistance to the Japanese invasion (p. 601), whereas actually the communists conserved their strength for the future struggle against the national government and were left unmolested for the same reason by the Japanese; his silence concerning the lethal espionage carried on by the Chinese for the benefit of the Japanese as a factor in the latter's rapid advance, and as evidenced in the two instances of attack on the British and Americans (pp. 607, 609).

These and similar omissions, however, are so slight that they hardly mar this excellent work which undoubtedly will realize the author's hopes that it will be of use to the general reader and serve as reliable textbook for teachers and students.

SISTO A. ROSSO

The Catholic University of America

The Four Cornerstones of Peace. By VERA MICHELES DEAN. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1946. Pp. xxiv, 267. $2.50.)

Judging from the contents of this book, it was written primarily with the purpose of answering American questions about the development and structural theory of the United Nations, before that body began its work. Some emphasis on regional agreements and on Russian policy is indicated in the choice of the documents, which consist of the Soviet treaties of alliance with Britain, France, and Czechoslovakia (but not with China), the Act of Chapultepec, the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, the Report of the Crimean Conference made by the United States Department of State, the Charter of the United Nations, and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. The compilation, with commentary, is not really an analysis of the achievements of the conferences, because it emphasizes the results in terms of organization with more casual reference to the political decisions. It is addressed to the American public on the level of high school seniors or college freshmen; and except for the final chapter, the discussion is political rather than historical, expository rather than critical. Each agreement is treated separately, much as though the others did not exist. There is a systematic effort to place Russian policy in the best possible light, especially with reference to international co-operation and to China and the Pacific. This may be done to offset American prejudice

in that direction; but the effect is one of understatement or exaggeration. American citizens of Finnish descent were not alone in creating pro-Finnish sentiment when Russia invaded Finland. It is not only the democratic system of government, but also the inherent rights of human beings that Great Britain and the United States have been trying to protect in the Balkans. It is inaccurate to say that Russia was the sole proponent of anti-fascism, unless "fascism" like "democracy" has taken on an esoteric meaning for Russians only. With millions employed in slave labor in the Soviet Union, it can hardly be said that a mere speech of Molotov "put Russia in the vanguard of nations demanding the protection of human rights," unless we take the word for the deed. Which is precisely what the author urges Americans not to do in the case of our own country.

In her final homily, Mrs. Dean advocates a change in the constitutional method of ratifying treaties, and advises citizens to become more articulate in informing the State Department, as well as Congress, of their views on foreign affairs. This is good advice, but their views will have little value unless they rest upon the solid foundation of factual knowledge and critical analysis of political motives, which in this book are little more than adumbrated.

ELIZABETH M. LYNSKEY

Hunter College

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Pierre-Simon Ballanche, Percursor of Romanticism. By ALBERT JOSEPH GEORGE. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. 1946. Pp. xv, 207.)

If the reader wonders at finding here a review of a book which from its sub-title seems to belong to pure literature, he should remember that the course of history, ecclesiastical as well as social and political, is determined by currents of ideas which find their expression in literary works. This is true of all ages but particularly of nineteenth-century French history, which cannot be understood without taking into account Chateaubriand, Lamennais, Victor Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, etc. Although immediately after his death his reputation "plummeted into oblivion reserved for the almost great," Pierre-Simon Ballanche, (1776-1847), played a not insignificant part in the movement of ideas which fermented in France and in western Europe after the fall of Napoleon. He was an essayist who analysed *Feeling in its Relations to Literature and Art* (1801), and a journalist who, in the thirties, pleaded with passion the cause of Polish independence. But above all he was a social philosopher who emulated the attempts of the Italian Vico and the German Herder to discover the laws of the evolution of society. To this object were devoted his *Essai sur*

les institutions sociales (1816), and his *Essais de palingénésie sociale* (1827). The *Palingénésie* or, as he sometimes called it, the *Théodicée de l'histoire*, constitutes Ballanche's greatest effort to give France a new philosophy in the picture of the human odyssey. It consists of a series of prolegomena for books already written or projected. Of these only one entitled *Orphée* appeared in complete form; the others were issued piecemeal. The entire philosophy of the work rested on the assumption of Charles Bonnet, the Geneva naturalist and philosopher, of "a perfect parallelism between the cosmic and organic systems; between the stages of the earth's evolution and the succession of living species," and "of a hierarchy of the forms of life beginning with infinitesimal matter and progressing to the pure intelligences who surround God." The presence of man on earth implies a punishment; man is held to conquer first his own dignity, then the grandeur of his destiny. After his downfall, man accepted responsibility for his actions, thus acquiring a capacity for good and evil, God reserving, however, the right to interfere in human affairs. This human semi-responsibility is taken as the key to the solution of the problem of evil; the fault lies with humanity and its abuse of its God-given freedom. Eventually the social solidarity that fuses men together yields to the more desirable spirit of charity as individuals grow more cognizant of the meaning of life, and as soon as man reaches the limits of his terrestrial evolution he enters the world and lives the super-life of pure intelligences, this being merely a new stage in a progress which must carry him to still higher spheres.

This view of humanity and of man's destiny, certain points of which seem to have been adopted by modern personalists, can be traced to the neoplatonism of the Alexandrian fathers. While at times it borders dangerously on pantheism, it was kept within the limits of orthodoxy by Ballanche's genuine attachment to his Catholic faith. This faith is strikingly exemplified in two parts of the *Palingénésie*, "L'Homme sans nom," which tells the story of a sinner's rehabilitation through meditation and self-imposed penance, and "La ville des expiations," which attempts to sketch a system of punishment of crime to be based no longer on the idea of vengeance and social security, but on the criminal's re-education and re-adaptation to social life. Every one interested in the history of ideas will be thankful to Professor George for his short but substantial and very readable introduction to "the gentle philosopher who was known to his age as *le bon Ballanche*." Our only regret is that he failed to provide an index to his work.

JULES A. BAISNÉE

The Catholic University of America

Charles Dickens. By UNA POPE-HENNESSY. (New York: Howell, Soskin, Publishers, Inc. 1946. Pp. xii, 488. $4.00.)

This latest volume is a valuable contribution to Dickens' biography, a biography which for years has been doing an effective job of outwitting historians. Dickens himself, his sister-in-law, Georgina, and Forster have conspired against a complete picture of "the inimitable." The occasion of this conspiracy was Dickens' separation from his wife, and its chief vehicle, Forster's classic biography of his friend, which grandly delineated the novelist's virtues but concealed his faults in the conviction "with anything else the public have nothing to do."

Later biographers were gradually correcting his errors and in 1934 Thomas Wright wrote an explosive article for the *Daily Express* which spot-lighted the unfortunate affair of Dickens with Ellen Lawless Ternan. Afterwards, Dickens' own daughter, Mrs. Perugini, quite vehemently corroborated all, as did the testimony of servants, Canon Benham, *et al.* We will never have complete documentation for a life of Dickens, for he burnt a large portion of his letters. His letters to Ellen Ternan, though we have testimony they were privately offered for sale in 1893, have since mysteriously disappeared.

The achievement of this new biography is the tasteful assimilation of all previous scholarship, plus the use of entirely new material, principally the 9,000 Nonesuch Letters. The very creditable result is a many-sided, detailed, accurate, realistic canvas of Dickens. While our idol is deservedly preserved, the streaks of egotism, ambition, irritability, and selfishness confess he was not ideal. We see he was quite as much flesh as blood. Yet in Dame Una Pope-Hennessy's pages we miss the profundity of these words of Chesterton, "his selfishness was wholly nerves. Whatever his whim or the temperature of the instant told him to do, must be done. . . . But there was this evil about it—that he did not resist his little weaknesses at all."

An additional advance over previous biographies is the fuller realization of the importance of Dickens as a social reformer. We are given an ample chronicle of those voluminous activities which synchronized his words and actions and the background of the day. The reader sees clearly his detestation of aristocratic government masquerading as democracy, his devastation of the chancery and government bureaucracy as the "circumlocution office," his satire of Parliament in which he had no faith. An entire chapter is devoted to Dickens' experiences in contemporary schools and factories, whose abuses were such perfect foils for his reform genius. There are snatches of his speeches to laboring groups, e.g., that the "working man should take his share in management." Though he was unfamiliar with the north of England, and the toiling masses there were never his main concern, we learn that his magazine, *Household Words,*

championed better housing and urged strong trade unions for the working men whose degradation was depicted in *Hard Times* as the by-product of the industrialization process.

His attitude towards all reform was his attitude towards the Poor Law. "Indeed by those who looked down on the scheme from above it seemed to work wonderfully well, but for those who looked at it from below it had few, if any, attractions. Dickens . . . always looked at schemes for social betterment from the underdog's position . . ."

It is true, as the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* stresses, Dickens "understood little of the economic processes," but it is more noteworthily true, as our author felicitously realizes "conscious of the power within him of stirring men to laughter or tears, he knew that if he could move them enough they must themselves seek to remedy their condition. The manner in which he worked on society was almost stealthy; it was as if he felt that it would invalidate the magic in his books, if it ever became generally known that he was a philanthropist at heart working for the abolition of slums, the founding of Ragged Schools and the reclaiming of girls from the streets. These activities for years remained a secret between himself and Miss Burdett Coutts. Some native instinct made him wise and caused him to realize that his real magic was vested in the wand, Romance, with which he could stir men powerfully to achieve their own salvation."

The defects of the book must be mentioned. There is the impression that one is being simply machine-gunned with fact after fact, detail after detail. The facts have mastered the author, not vice versa. The scholarly, observant treatment, never emotionally stampeded, attains real objectivity, but it sometimes sinks to the objectivity of an adding machine. Nor is there in general a brilliant, beautiful prose to remove the occasional threat of tediousness.

EDWARD F. KENRICK

Cardinal Hayes High School
New York City

A Short History of Eritrea. By STEPHEN H. LONGRIGG. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1946. Pp. 188. $3.50.)

Our military forces were stationed in many strange areas during the years of the war. There was always a mild interest in the local situation, but the reviewer does not know any of our personnel who made a scholarly study of the peoples with whom we were in contact. The British have a different tradition. This excellent monograph was written by the military administrator, later the chief administrator, during three years of the British occupation of the former Italian colony. It was designed for the

statesmen and public who would decide the fate of Eritrea, and since the disposition of the Italian colonies is still one of the unresolved problems of the peace, its information is of contemporary interest. In addition, new weapons have lessened the value of the Mediterranean and given new importance to the Cape route; hence the geopolitical significance of East Africa has been enhanced. The withdrawal of the British from Egypt has concentrated interest in Eritrea as a base for the defense of the Middle East. With the shadow of the Soviet falling on the Levant, this Italian colony is assuming a position in international relations even greater than that claimed by the author.

This small colony, historically important as the gateway of Ethiopia, contains many diverse racial strains, grouped by fantastic legends of high ancestry. It possesses no linguistic, cultural, or economic homogeneity, and it has none of the qualities that should entitle it to be a unit of government. Only the vagaries of imperialism that led to its seizure by a newly united and competitive nationalism in the late nineteenth century accounts for its existence; and only the restraints placed upon that power by rival imperialisms and especially by the disastrous defeat at Adua in 1896, prevented its extension to more natural frontiers. As it stands, it has little excuse for existence, and the most important conclusion of the author calls for its dissolution into its components.

In the narrow compass of this volume, General Longrigg sifts the legends and facts that comprise the past of Eritrea, and by adroit selection and condensation, he presents the outlines of its development with emphasis on the social and cultural complexities which shaped its present. A generous list of sources will encourage the special student, and the appetite for further knowledge is whetted by references to such famous missionaries as the Bishops de Jacobis and Massaia, and to the long series of European visitors since the coming of the Portuguese in the fifteenth century.

To achieve the brevity of the present work, the author ignored the complicated international situation that led to the establishment of the colony in 1882: French desire to placate Italian wrath over the occupation of Tunisia; a British invitation, stemming from rivalry with the French, for Italy to establish herself in the Red Sea area; and the ambition of the new nation, in Mancini's celebrated phrase, to find the keys to the Mediterranean in the Red Sea, and to open up a corridor to Libya that would form an integrated empire in northeastern Africa.

He does, however, pay generous tribute to the half century of Italian rule that gave the colony an entity, an administrative system, a conception of tranquillity, security and public health, and modern equipment far ahead of the usual colonial standards. The tragedy of facism is indicated both in the dislocation of the colonial structure and in its ultimate loss. His

approach awakened in this reviewer a dim hope that a chastened Italy would be permitted to continue the administration of Eritrea under United Nations supervision. While the author does not propose this solution, it does seem to be the only method of preserving the gains for the natives and of providing for the 40,000 Italian residents of the colony.

JOSEPH N. MOODY

Cathedral College
New York City

AMERICAN HISTORY

Government and Labor in Early America. By RICHARD B. MORRIS. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1946. Pp. xvi, 557. $6.75.)

Dr. Morris' analysis of the "relations, prior to the rise of trade unionism, between labor and government," is almost overwhelming in the exhaustiveness of its research. It can be said with fairness even to the late John R. Commons and the Wisconsin school of labor history that never before has any single period in the history of American industrial relations been explored with such incredible thoroughness. What Dr. Morris has in common with the latter school is an almost total disregard for popularity—a virtue which, understandably enough, has been extremely rare among writers dealing with a subject which lends itself so readily to the human interest approach. Neither Morris nor Commons will be read from cover to cover by more than a handful of students, but fifty years from now their research will continue to be plagarized.

Let Dr. Morris' own description of his labors stand as evidence of his thoroughness and as an inspiration and a stimulus to his fellow-historians: "Some twenty thousand cases, largely unpublished, have been reviewed in the course of the investigation. . . . The principal source has been a field largely unexplored . . . the unpublished inferior court records of the American colonies. To examine these, the writer traversed the Eastern seaboard from Wiscasset, Maine, and Woodsville, New Hampshire, to St. Augustine, Florida. Statutes, town ordinances, and vestry books complemented the judicial records. Wherever possible these sources were supplemented by contemporary newspapers, accounts of travelers, diaries, letter books, military order books, and business papers."

The author confines his study of early American labor conditions and labor relations to an analysis of "the legal and social position of free and bound labor." The reader is referred to the standard sources for an analysis of slavery.

Central to the whole analysis is the conclusion—which suggests itself implicitly in every chapter and is referred to explicitly only in the author's

introduction and concluding summary—that the "revolution in the government's relations with business and labor, inaugurated in 1933 and gaining increased momentum in the course of the Second World War, does not mark the first appearance in this country of a system of elaborate government controls over the economic order." In effect, the purpose of the book is to describe these "elaborate governmental controls" of the colonial period in the most minute detail. All that can be done in a short review is to refer to some of them very briefly and to indicate their pertinence to the study of contemporary twentieth-century industrial relations.

1. The labor shortage in the colonial era dictated a liberal immigration policy—a policy which added up in practice to a system of contract labor. It will come as a surprise to some that "the introduction into this country of contract labor has continued down to fairly recent years." Dr. Morris' detailed analysis of the effects of the system will make it easier to understand the apparently reactionary position of the organized labor movement in the United States towards the question of immigration and immigration laws.

2. The current system of convict labor—which, again, the American labor movement opposes or at least attempts to regulate—found its parallel in colonial days in the "practice of binding out to service persons convicted of crimes against property and of imposing extra service upon servants for various types of wrongful conduct, including absenteeism and desertion."

3. Fortunately the colonial practice of binding out the pauper and the child to labor has been superseded in more recent years by a system of public aid designed to keep dependent children in the home or at least in satisfactory foster homes.

4. Colonial apprenticeship has survived in the practices of contemporary craft unions but has been regularized by trade agreements, which guarantee the freedom of the apprenticed worker.

5. The employment of women and children was taken for granted in the colonial period and was piously defended even by ministers of religion. The practice has been regulated to some extent in very recent years by federal and state legislation—but only in the face of fanatical and rather hypocritical opposition.

6. The colonial master's quasi-proprietary interest in the services of his servant has been largely broken down, although "vestiges of this property concept survive in modern state legislation prohibiting the enticement of employees although the employment is at will."

7. Absenteeism was just as uncontrollable during colonial days as it was during the critical period of World War II.

8. Contemporary workmen's compensation laws are an improvement on the practice of the colonial period, although even in those distant days

"masters were expected to provide medical assistance for bound employees who fell ill in the course of their employment."

9. The right of state governments to regulate prices and wages was taken for granted in the colonial period. Experiments in this direction failed, "not because of the impossibility of regulation per se, but rather because of the failure of the Continental Congress and the states to stem the currency crisis." In contemporary America—with the exception of the period during the two World Wars— minimum wage legislation has been substituted for the maximum-wage policy of the Revolutionary era.

10. The organization of labor into bona fide trade unions was a virtual impossibility during the colonial period "because of the fluid character of the colonial labor market," but "disgruntled labor adopted one or the other of two patterns of behavior—incorrigible conduct or legal redress by petition to the court." The author's careful analysis of the many tentative and haphazard antecedents to contemporary trade unionism adds considerably to our knowledge of a field which one would have thought had already been covered rather adequately.

The foregoing summary is little short of insulting in its inadequacy, for it does not begin to indicate, let alone digest, the richness of Dr. Morris investigation. Perhaps it is enough of a summary, however, to substantiate the author's conclusion that "democracy, as we understand the term today, was not by any means achieved with the Revolution, but the process of freeing the individual from restraints that were external in origin was accelerated, and mercantilism was one of the principal casualties."

Government and Labor in Early America is intended primarily for the professional historian, but it literally cries out for popularization, so that the die-hard defenders of the status quo may be stopped in their tracks. Anyone who has read Dr. Morris' monumental study will think twice before he extols the allegedly laissez-faire paradise of the colonial period at the expense of contemporary social and economic legislation. Colonial governmental intervention may have been a good thing or a bad thing; it may have been necessary or unnecessary. But withal it was a fact which has yet to be reckoned with adequately by the propagandists for Manchester liberalism.

GEORGE G. HIGGINS
National Catholic Welfare Conference

Saints and Strangers, Being the Lives of the Pilgrim Fathers and Their Families, with Their Friends and Foes; and an Account of Their Posthumous Wanderings in Limbo, Their Final Resurrection and Rise to Glory, and the Strange Pilgrimage of Plymouth Rock. By GEORGE F. WILLISON. (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 1945. Pp. ix, 513. $3.75.)

In his preface the author pays tribute to Henry Martyn Dexter, Edward Arber, and Charles Edward Banks for their original researches which made possible this popular history, an enjoyable and complete relation of the Pilgrims *et al*, as set forth in the long title. Persons, places, and events are depicted in such a plain style that no journalist or library story teller will ever be excused for an incorrect presentation from now on; for as a story teller himself Mr. Willison has clearly been at great pains to be accurate and thorough. Beginning with the Brewster family at Scrooby, he portrays the evolution of the refugee communities in Holland; he understands the trials and tribulations of the Green Gate community at Leyden which motivated a portion of them to move to America; he gives a careful history of the *Mayflower* and the first years on the coast of New England; and he carries the narrative through the seventeenth century to the absorption of the Old Colony into that of the Massachusetts Bay. On the legend which developed, the story of Plymouth Rock, the Thanksgiving celebration, and the Society of Mayflower Descendants, Mr. Willison is forceful, tolerant, and amusing; nowhere else can a better presentation of the Pilgrim myth in American history be found. But with all this it must be noted that he resembles William Bradford in his confidence that the "simple" truth is always obvious. He shares with his subjects a profound impatience with complexities, particularly where religion is concerned. His anxiety to be precise about details of ships, geography, and numbers of passengers is not paralleled by an equal conscientiousness about theological matters. He is very loose in his differentiation of Separatist and Congregationalist, and much worse when it comes to an appreciation of Roman Catholicism. His prejudices are to him the plain facts of the matter, propounded in a manner as irritating as was ever possessed by one of the "saints." On the nature of the Protestant Revolt for example, Mr. Willison is of the opinion (p. 18) that it brought the light of open-minded inquiry, for until that time Christians had believed only what the whim of the several popes made dogma! No wonder, therefore, that Robert Browne, the Separatist, is adjudged "the most creative religious thinker of his day" (p. 30). For similar talents Robert J. Ingersoll would probably be esteemed the most eminent religious mind of the nineteenth century. Further evidence of simplicity may be found in the unconscious tribute to totalitarianisms when the author remarks on the blessing that at Plymouth the civil authority always retained supreme control "both *de jure* and *de facto*" over the religious (p. 182).

There is an extensive bibliography, and the notes are informative when they are relevant. An appendix lists the "Pilgrim Company" to 1631. The writing is undistinguished.

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

Lincoln the President: Springfield to Gettysburg. By J. G. RANDALL. Two Volumes. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1945. Pp. xxi, 395; vii, 439. $7.50.)

To say that Professor Randall's work is a great book is only to repeat the opinion of experts, but the greater the expert, the greater will be the reader's appreciation of the real value of his two volumes. Its appeal to some general readers will be limited, because it is not a full length biography such as those of Sandburg, Tarbell, Charnwood, and Barton. But the subject is so vast and complicated, that it lends itself better to a study of a particular phase of Lincoln's career.

This is one of the first Lincoln books of first-rate importance written by a professional historian and the author's professional skill is more than apparent. After a general background, the author deals with Lincoln principally from his Springfield political days to the Gettysburg Address. In a twenty-two page appendix to Volume II he discusses the Ann Rutledge romance. From a chronological standpoint, this would appear to have no place in the book. But it is one of the controversial points in Lincoln's life and Randall's discussion is more interesting, because it includes the latest evidence on the subject. The footnotes, the index, and particularly the bibliography give additional evidence that this work will stand out as a real and scholarly contribution in a field that to some may appear exhausted.

There is probably no period in American history which has been subjected to such research. The evidence is conflicting, some of it unreliable, and despite the passage of time it still lends itself to partisans. For that reason, Randall's book is just what many Lincoln students, both amateur and professional, have been waiting for. The evidence on matters of dispute is carefully presented, pro and con, discussed at length, and in many cases followed by an opinion of the author which is always interesting. In this respect it is like Barton's *Life of Lincoln,* except that it is more scholarly. A better comparison would be of Milton's *The Eve of Conflict,* which discusses many of the same topics. It is always of value to know the author's opinion, and especially in a field that has reached the proportions of Lincoln history.

The interpretation of many events in the life of Lincoln is, to some extent, new in that it agrees more with the southern viewpoint than has been the practice heretofore. In Freeman's life of Lee, it was generally stated that McClellan was the outstanding military leader of the North. These volumes by Randall do for McClellan what Beverage did for Stephen A. Douglas; they give him a proper place in history. The evidence in support of McClellan is presented in a convincing and interesting fashion. It even appears that Lincoln was aware of the soundness of Mc-

Clellan's military judgment, but the radicals, including the President's secretaries, were determined to destroy him for political reasons and the President reluctantly gave way. The Emancipation Proclamation has been put in its proper political setting with much of the glamor removed. It is an example of the author's rare courage in dealing with subjects that are steeped in tradition.

No Lincoln history will satisfy all Lincoln students because the questions of dispute have reached a point, which to the casual reader, appear out of proportion to their importance. Even the amateurs have fixed opinions regarding these matters. For example, the author's analysis of the wedding default controversy and his judgment are undoubtedly correct. He discusses all the evidence and comes to the very definite conclusion that there is no reliable evidence to support Herndon and Weik, who claimed that there was a wedding default. To some, a contrary conclusion seems more logical. If one gives any reliance to the statements of Mary Todd's sisters, reported by Herndon and Weik, they should be construed most strongly in favor of the wedding default, because they cast a reflection on the family and for that reason are almost an admission against interest. Also, a wedding default would be such an unusual event that time would not dim the family's memory regarding the event.

Randall's treatment of the Crittenden Compromise appears to have been influenced by his judgment that the plan was not workable. Some other historians feel that this or some other compromise might have succeeded, and to some extent they hold Lincoln responsible for the war because of his failure to endorse the compromise before he took office, and when it was too late to compromise, to endorse it in principle. Randall does not mention that Buchanan, Seward, and Crittenden had each sent messengers to Springfield endeavoring to influence Lincoln to endorse the plan. Whatever northern responsibility there was for failure to compromise is placed on the radicals by Randall, while others are inclined to include Lincoln among those responsible.

The treatment of Lincoln's delicate handling of diplomacy, both foreign and domestic, tends to prove that Lincoln's real greatness may have been his ability to analyze the reactions of men and nations with absolute disregard of his personal feelings. He was a master at getting along with people under trying circumstances. At times, he may have conceded too much to his would-be friends. Professor Randall really makes Lincoln and his times better known and understood in this scholarly work. The expectant release of new Lincoln material and Mr. Randall's promise of an additional work are welcome news to students of the period.

THOMAS B. DUNN

Morris, Illinois

American-Russian Rivalry in the Far East. A Study in Diplomacy and Power Politics, 1895-1914. By EDWARD H. ZABRISKIE. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1946. Pages vii, 226. $3.50.)

In recent years it has been a fashion among professional promoters of American-Russian amity and also among some historians and political scientists of repute to preach that due to lack of conflicting interest Russia and the United States have always enjoyed traditional friendship; and thus America, to continue this unbroken friendship with Russia, should concede to Soviet Russia's demands in the Far East. But the fact remains that there has been American-Russian rivalry in the Far East in the past, and today the same rivalry, due to conflicting interests or divergent policies of these powers, is manifesting itself in an acute form. Professor Zabriskie's well-written and carefully documented work gives background to the present-day tension between two great powers and thus is an indispensable work for the students of far eastern affairs.

To be sure, in the past there has been American-Russian co-operation in world politics; but this was primarily due to the existence of Anglo-Russion rivalry which induced Russia to seek the friendship of America which was also at the time opposed to British foreign policies. Professor Zabriskie with documentary evidence makes it clear that there has been a continuity of Russian policy in the Far East; and this policy is Russian expansion to the Pacific for the purpose of assuming virtual and eventual control over China and Korea. On the other hand, American policy, from the days of the Opium War, has been for equal opportunity for commerce and opposition to partition of China. Since 1860, when Tsarist Russia in violation of the then existing Russo-Chinese treaty annexed Vladivostock, and on subsequent occasions whenever she encroached upon Chinese sovereignty, American policy has been definitely opposed to Russian policies in the Far East.

In 1895, Prince Lobanov, the then Russian foreign minister, enunciated the Russian foreign policy in his instructions to the Russian minister to Peking. He wrote: "It is no less important for our projects to bring China into a sort of dependence in relation to ourselves and not to let England extend her influence in China" (p. 30). Count Witte's program of building railways in Siberia and Manchuria and later on the extension of the program to northern China was also for the same purpose—so-called peaceful penetration and economic control. Russia sought American friendship to check any possibility of Anglo-American co-operation in the Far East against Russian expansion.

As early as 1898, Russia was opposed to any form of Anglo-American rapprochement, to American occupation of the Philippines; and it was for dismemberment of the British Empire and also in favor of conflict be-

tween England and the United States and also a war between Japan and the United States. This is rather startling, because the same has been the policy of Soviet Russia, as enunciated by Lenin himself. Professor Zabriski gives us in the appendices the instructions of the tsarist foreign minister, Muraviev, to Cassini, the ambassador to Washington and letters of Cassini to Muraviev and Lamsdorf, to prove the above thesis. Muraviev wrote to Cassini: "While remaining in the aura of Russian-American friendship you must make every endeavor to create conflicts between the Federal Government [the United States of America] and England and Japan . . . Of special interest in this connection are the increased tensions between the United States and Canada . . . The secession of Canada from its metropolis has extreme importance for us . . . Would the United States, already having assumed the status of a great power, preserve the same passive good will toward our policies, after the dismemberment of England, or would it become a competitor with whom we would have to deal as now with Great Britain?" (pp. 202-203). While on June 23, 1898, from Washington, Cassini wrote to Lamsdorf in the following manner: "As for the growing rapprochement between the United States and Great Britain—this rapprochement is beyond doubt . . . This rapprochement which might in spite of everything lead to a closer agreement between these two great naval powers, compels us to regard the occupation of the Philippines by the United States with considerably less well-wishing" (pp. 204-205).

It was to check possible domination of China by Russia, that the Anglo-American powers aided Japan during the Russo-Japanese War. But Russia, after the Treaty of Portsmouth, favored understanding with Japan not only to partition Manchuria between themselves, but also to check any increase of American political and economic influence in these regions. These and other facts are very ably and objectively discussed in the chapters on "Anti-American Front" and "Failure of Dollar Diplomacy" during the administration of President Taft.

A nation's foreign policy is based upon its vital interests and, therefore, it often has a continuity, in spite of change of the form of the government of a country. Today Soviet Russia is virtually pursuing tsarist foreign policy in the Far East with greater vigor; and the government of the United States, pursuing its traditional foreign policy towards China and for the preservation of her interests in the Far East, is opposing Soviet Russian expansion and possible control of China.

The work under review is a valuable contribution to the study of American-Russian relations and the foreign policies of these two powers as influenced by the conditions in the Far East.

TARAKNATH DAS

New York University

Midwest at Noon. By GRAHAM HUTTON. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1946. Pp. xv, 351. $3.75.)

A British government official who spent several years in the Middle West has made a rather successful attempt to be a modern Bryce, taking the Middle West rather than the country as a whole for his subject. He has essayed a study of the life, habits, and characteristics of the people and the land in which they live. His British education evidently gave him a remarkable respect for facts, but it unfortunately left him somewhat at a loss for valid principles of interpretation.

The author sought to provide as complete a survey as possible of the history, geography, politics, culture, and particular problems of the area. So much information is condensed in so little space that numerous invalid generalizations were bound to appear. At times the factual information is so detailed that the numerous statistics and labored interpretations become very boring. It is precisely in the interpretations that the book is weak. The author's sociological and philosophical standards are somewhat shallow, when it is possible to discern standards of any kind. It is not unusual to find opposing conclusions within a few pages of text. For example, after pointing out the alarming increase in the divorce rate the author discusses at some length the untamed life of young people and concludes that despite all the freedom they are soon ready to settle down to a stable family life.

The great work of the Catholic Church in the Middle West is almost completely ignored. The outstanding missionaries who did so much for the settlers and whose influence endures today in many places are not even mentioned. An even more glaring omission is Catholic education. The voluntary sacrifice of the Catholic people of the area to provide an education for their children conformable to truth and satisfactory to their consciences is unparalleled in the modern world. The vast system of education, running from kindergarten through the university, was built without a cent of public money and saves the taxpayers millions of dollars annually, but Mr. Hutton did not consider it a matter of importance to his picture of the Middle West. The universally recognized social work of the Church is totally ignored. In fact, the only Catholic priest mentioned in the entire book, unless the reviewer's memory fails him, is Father Coughlin.

The reviewer is not going to disparage these criticisms by saying that they are a mere detail and only slightly mar a valuable book. To say that would not be true. They destroy to great extent the value of the book as an over-all picture of middle western life. But, on the other hand, this is not to say that the book is useless. It is a valuable compilation of information about a very important part of the world, and as such makes

the author deserving of our thanks. He has obviously put great effort into his work and has included a fairly adequate index.

Mr. Hutton's foreword admits gaps in his work, but he would have done better to point out the gaps in the course of his book. To the reading public in the Middle West and to American historians and sociologists, parts of the book will make interesting reading but it must be remembered that the work as a whole presents a very inadequate picture.

JAMES B. WALKER

Dominican House of Studies
River Forest, Illinois

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The summer course in the Preservation and Administration of Archives given at the National Archives from June 17 to July 6 was highly successful. The problems of cataloging, indexing, calendaring, reproduction, and preservation by the process of lamination were thoroughly treated by the staff of lecturers, headed by Dr. Ernst Posner. Three days were spent at the Maryland Hall of Records in Annapolis where the problems of the smaller archives were canvassed. During the summer of 1945 there were fifteen enrolled in the course, six of whom were from Catholic institutions. This summer four of the fourteen members of the course were from Catholic institutions: Peter P. Beckmann, O.S.B., St. Benedict's College; Henry J. Browne, Archdiocese of New York; Wilfred S. Schoenberg, S. J., Gonzaga University, and the Managing Editor of the REVIEW. Other institutions represented during the 1946 session were Princeton University, Swarthmore College, Colonial Williamsburg, New Jersey State Library, and several of the records divisions of the Federal Government's departments. All were agreed that the instruction offered during the course was of a very high quality, and it was felt that the experience had been of genuine profit to those who have the care of ecclesiastical archives in various centers.

One collection of historical materials that is badly needed by historians of the Catholic Church in the United States is a footnoted edition of the papal documents bearing on the Church in this country. The *Pontificia Americana* of Donald C. Shearer, O.M.Cap., covers only the period 1784 to 1884 and does not include every document from the popes to persons in the United States. The dependence of most Catholic writers on Father John J. Wynne's translation of the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII has led to a rather curious error in the use of the title of the apostolic letter, *Longinqua Oceani*, which is commonly listed as *Longinque Oceani*. But this is only one of several errors that could be avoided by a more scientific edition of these official documents.

Parish histories have become a necessary adjunct of centennial celebrations and other jubilees. It is to be deeply regretted that so many of these publications are prepared by well-meaning but unqualified journalists. The important general facts about a parish or institution can be gleaned without any great effort from ordinary statistical publications. The chief contribution these parish and local histories can make lies in homely facts dealing with the people, their circumstances, and the practical manifestations of their faith. Such matter makes delightful reading within the parish and is useful to the general historian. The series of articles currently appearing in the *Indiana Magazine of History*, from the pen of

Elfreida Lang on the German settlement of Dubois County, Indiana, offer one of the best examples of scientific and yet interesting history in a community that is almost entirely Catholic. Incidentally, the labors of Father Joseph Kundeck figure prominently in the early history of the community.

With the increasing emphasis on scientific care and preservation of archives it is good to have such articles as that of Conrad Morin, O.F.M., of the University of Montreal which appears in the June, 1946, issue of *Culture* entitled: "Les Archives du Saint-Siège, importantes sources de l'histoire politico-religieuse du Canada." The article affords the research student a good preliminary guide by which he can acquaint himself with the holdings of the Vatican archives on the Canadian Catholic Church and, in turn, with the holdings in Roman documents of various Canadian archives. Naturally the main emphasis is on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Students of nineteenth-century church history would also be grateful if Father Conrad could bring the holdings of the ecclesiastical archives of Canada to their attention for the more recent period.

The managing editor of the REVIEW spent an enjoyable two days on July 25-26 at Mount Saint Mary's College in Emmitsburg, where he experienced the warm hospitality for which that institution is famous. The archives of this second oldest American Catholic college are extensive. There are over seventy file boxes of correspondence dating from 1808 to 1938 arranged chronologically by months in folders within the boxes. There are, as well, a number of unsorted boxes of correspondence, over twenty file boxes of financial papers, dozens of ledgers, journals, notebooks, student records, old issues of the *Catholic Directory*, and several fairly long runs of old Catholic newspapers. Provision is to be made in the new library building to house these important archives, and it is the hope of Hugh J. Phillips, the archivist, that the work of indexing the papers can soon be speeded up so that the entire collection may be indexed and calendared for the sesquicentennial of Mount Saint Mary's, which is to be celebrated in 1958.

The Maryland Historical Society has acquired a number of interesting collections during the last quarter. Among these are deed and land papers, Baltimore and Prince Georges County, 1684-1853; King papers, including deeds and correspondence dealing with lands at Kingsville (Baltimore County), in Chester County, Pennsylvania, and in Mississippi; Rodgers papers, 1794-1914, including business papers and Civil War muster rolls; the register of the Trinity Episcopal Church, Baltimore, 1815-1936; letterbook, 1825-1839, and two account books, 1824-1864, of Thomas Ferguson, Baltimore merchant; and minute books of the Govanstown Academy, 1835-1855.

Work is progressing at the New York Archdiocesan Archives, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, New York, in the calendaring of the materials relating to the life and administration of John Hughes, first Archbishop of New York. This collection comprises the original materials from the files of the archdiocese and an extensive accumulation of transcripts and photostats from European and other archives.

In recent years there has been considerable discussion about the problems of inter-racial justice among Catholics. The whole approach to the problem has been hampered by the apparent lack of intelligent discussion and writing on the question in generations past. However, the record is not wholly bad, and there is need of a scientific examination of the activities in and for Negro Catholics in the United States. To be fully useful the investigation should include not only the efforts to increase these activities but also a careful scrutiny of the prejudices and objections to them. Of course, there has never been a valid theological support for these prejudices, but the political, social, and economic arguments that influenced persons dealing with this problem in the country are only vaguely understood, and should be more accurately exposed.

Volume XXXV of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society brings to the reader the printed address of Professor Ross J. S. Hoffman of Fordham University on "The American Republic and Western Christendom," delivered before the Society on December 11, 1945, a series of reprints from the *Catholic News* on the controversial point of New York City's oldest Catholic Church structure, the master's thesis of George E. Tiffany on "The Catholic Church and the Changing Frontier, 1699-1812," and a well-documented article by Henry J. Browne on "The 'Italian Problem' in the Catholic Church of the United States, 1880-1900." Father Tiffany was the first student to receive the M.A. degree under the revived program for that degree at St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers. He is now working for the doctorate at Harvard. Father Browne, who contributed an article to our April issue, employed unpublished materials in the archives of the Archdioceses of New York and Baltimore to bring to light some very interesting aspects of problems confronting the bishops because of the thousands of Italian immigrants in the last decades of the nineteenth century.

The Hearst Foundation has announced that $100,000 has been granted to the University of Notre Dame to be used for scholarships in American history. For the year 1946-47 the University has decided that the income from the donation will be used to establish four $500 scholarships available to graduate students in American history who can demonstrate certain aptitudes for research.

The Catholic Theological Society of America was formally inaugurated

on June 25 at a meeting held at the Hotel Commodore in New York. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., of the Catholic University of America, was elected as the first president; Girard Yelle, S.S., of the Grand Seminary, Montreal, as vice-president; Joseph C. Fenton, of the Catholic University of America, as secretary, and James E. Rea, of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, as treasurer. The directors of the new society number William R. O'Connor, Joseph A. Quigley, John Courtnay Murray, S. J., David Baier, O.F.M., Thomas O. Martin, and Richard T. Doherty.

The Academy of American Franciscan History of Washington, D. C., will formally open its new building in Bethesda, Maryland, on October 9, 1946, according to Roderick Wheeler, O.F.M., director. The ceremonies will begin with a solemn high Mass celebrated by the minister general of the Franciscan Order, the Most Reverend Valentine Schaaf, formerly a professor of canon law in the Catholic University of America, assisted by the delegate general for North and Central America and adjacent islands, the Very Reverend Mathias Faust. This will be followed by the blessing of the premises in the afternoon and by a dinner and academic session in the evening.

Luther Evans, Librarian of Congress, accompanied by Francisco de Aguilera, assistant director of the Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress, visited Peru in July in connection with the opening of the new building of the National Library of Lima. In the name of the United States Government, Dr. Evans presented the Library with a gift of 10,000 American books, selected by the American Library Association.

Lewis Hanke, director of the Hispanic Foundation, Library of Congress, plans to leave shortly for Spain, where he will give a series of lectures at La Rábida under the auspices of the Spanish Government. During his stay in Europe Dr. Hanke will also visit Portugal, France, and England.

The Fourth Assembly of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History was held in Caracas, Venezuela, from August 25 to September 1, 1946. The Catholic University of America was represented at the sessions by Dr. Roscoe R. Hill, head of the State Department Archives, National Archives, who forms part of the official American delegation.

The fourth volume of *La anexión de Centroamérica a México*, edited by Rafael Heliodoro Valle, with documents and other writings covering the period January-June 1823, appeared in 1945 in the series, Archivo histórico diplomático mexicano, published by the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Academia de la Historia de Cuba has issued *Origen y régimen de la propiedad territorial en Cuba* (La Habana, 1946) from the pen of Francisco Pérez de la Riva.

The status of woman from ancient times to the end of the middle ages is the subject of the seventh annual series of studies published by the students of Marygrove College, Detroit. The volume bears the title, *Into Her Own*. It begins and ends with a presentation of what recent popes have said concerning the dignity and duties of womanhood. Nineteen articles are devoted to the position of woman from pre-Christian times to the end of the mediaeval period. The subject afforded great inspiration to the students. They have profited by wide reading and careful direction. The studies and bibliography will be useful to many readers.

The American Book Center for War Devastated Libraries, Inc., is endeavoring to reach scholars and specialists in an appeal for scholarly books and periodicals that will be useful in research and necessary in the physical, economic, social, and industrial rehabilitation and reconstruction of Europe and the Far East. Textbooks, out-dated monographs, children's books, light fiction, popular non-fiction, popular magazines are *not* wanted. Federal and local documents should not be sent without inquiry. Shipments should be forwarded prepaid to the American Book Center, c/o The Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

Oxford University Press is publishing *Recording Britain*, a four-volume set containing pictures of interesting churches, houses, monuments, streets, etc., in England. Each volume will contain eight plates in color and ninety-six in duotone from among 1,549 pictures produced by artists since 1940 in a project to record the changing face of Britain. The subscription price is five guineas.

Because of the war few if any of our readers saw the first edition of Louis Halphen's *Initiation aux études d'histoire du moyen âge*, prepared in 1939. The little work is now available in a revised edition (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 108, Boulevard Saint-Germain. 1946. Pp. 175. 80 francs). It gives the general bibliography that a mediaevalist must know and use. Almost every item is followed by illuminating and critically discerning comment. Designed especially for students in France, the volume is very helpful for the history of other parts of mediaeval Europe. Readers familiar with the writings of Professor Halphen will recall his wide grasp of bibliography in many languages. This guide contains many little remarks of practical wisdom and numerous indications concerning instruments of research that are being prepared for publication. It is not alone the tyro in mediaeval studies that will find the book useful.

Jacques Zeiller, historian, and professor in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes of Paris, has been named president of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in France. It is interesting to see an historian taking over the great social work of the historian Ozanam.

Saint Philippe Neri, apôtre de la sincérité is the title of an interesting published sermon by Baudouin de Gaiffier, S.J., of the Bollandists. (Privately printed, Bruxelles, 1945.)

For various and complicated reasons Spain has failed, up to recently, to state its case before the outside world. To a very large extent the enemies of the Spanish government have had the ear of the American public. This year the Spanish Embassy in Washington has been issuing an information bulletin, *Spain*. The June number gives the interesting text of Franco's review and program of Spain's policy presented to the Cortes on May 14. The July number gives a variety of news and notes on activities and attitudes in Spain. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Plaza de Provincia, Madrid) is issuing a monthly *Spanish Cultural Index*. The forty-page issue for July is filled with an account of the remarkably lusty cultural life of Spain at present. Among many items of interest it gives reports of the international congress of Pax Romana, of the first congress of Universitas, new international association of Catholic professors, and of the celebration of the fourth centenary of Francisco de Vitoria, all held at Salamanca. A detailed report of these meetings is also available in the July-August number of *Razón y Fe*.

Karl Haushofer, Munich professor of geopolitics, died by suicide. He left a document acknowledging his mistake in allowing his writings on geopolitics to be used by the Nazis as "scientific justification" for invading other countries.

Kreuz and Hakenkreuz, a volume compiled by Monsignor Johann Neuhaeusler and published under the auspices of the Archdiocese of Munich, gives the facts of the Nazi persecution of the Church and of Catholic resistance to the Nazis. Its 800 pages reveal for the first time many data and documents that offer further confirmation of the heroism of the Christian fight against the oppressors.

In commemoration of the seventieth birthday of Father Livarius Oliger, O.F.M., his friends and former students presented him with a volume of *Miscellanea historica*. It appears as the 1945 volume of *Antonianum*. Father A. Kleinhans, O.F.M., writes the "De vita et scriptis R. P. Oliger." The distinguished professor of the Antonianum and the Lateran was born in the Diocese of Metz. Since 1905 he has worked and taught in Rome and at Quaracchi. He has written continuously since 1904. The articles of the *Festschrift* that have special interest for our readers are listed in our Periodical Literature.

The REVIEW wishes to extend its congratulations and best wishes to Frederick E. Welfle, S.J., one of our advisory editors, who on July 31 took over his new position as president of John Carroll University in Cleveland.

Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M., sometime associate professor of Ibero-American history at the Catholic University of America, has been appointed a corresponding member of the Spanish Academy of History.

Manoel S. Cardozo of the Department of History, The Catholic University of America, was decorated by the Brazilian Government with the Rio Branco Medal at a special ceremony at the Brazilian Embassy on August 6, 1946. The presentation was made by Dr. Octávio do Nascimento Brito, Minister Counsellor.

Following a tenure of twenty-one years, during which he taught ancient and mediaeval history, at Pennsylvania State College, Professor Francis J. Tschan retired on July 1 with the rank of emeritus professor. Professor Tschan, who is 1946 program chairman of the American Catholic Historical Association, received his undergraduate and part of his graduate training at Loyola University, Chicago. He took the doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1916, and later taught at Chicago, Yale, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology. He plans to use part of his newly-won leisure to complete another volume on Bernward of Hildesheim after he finishes a work on Adam of Bremen on which he is now employed. Professor Tschan was President of the American Catholic Historical Association in 1930.

Professor J. D. M. Ford pays a discerning tribute to the great Spanish Arabic scholar, the late Father Miguel Asín Palacios, in the July number of *Speculum*.

In the same number friends of Edward Kennard Rand will find a detailed *in memoriam* notice by three of his collaborators in the Mediaeval Academy of America.

Aidan H. Germain, O.S.B., a member of the Benedictine community of St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota, died in San Antonio on April 22. Father Aidan took his doctorate in history at the Catholic University of America in 1929 and was the author of *Catholic Military and Naval Chaplains, 1776-1917* (Washington, 1929). After a number of years of teaching in various institutions he joined the armed forces as a chaplain and was still in service at the time of his death.

Louis Pelzer, managing editor of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, died suddenly of a heart attack on June 28. Professor Pelzer was in his sixty-seventh year. He was trained at the State University of Iowa, where he took the doctorate in 1909, and since 1925 he had held the rank of a full professor in that university. His published work had been principally on the history of the Middle West, one of his last books being *The Cattlemen's Frontier*, published in 1936.

On July 27 Fred L. Holmes, Catholic writer and historian of note, died suddenly while speaking at a centennial celebration at his native village of Waukau, Wisconsin. Mr. Holmes, besides a book on Lincoln and one on Washington, wrote charmingly about the local history of Wisconsin. *Alluring Wisconsin, Badger Saints and Sinners,* and *Old World Wisconsin* are three of his best books.

July 15 to August 11 was officially set aside to celebrate the centennial of the corporate organization of the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Juneau Park, on the lake front, was temporarily turned over to pageantry and amusement in honor of the occasion. Sunday, July 21, was designated a day of thanksgiving in all the churches. Archbishop Moses E. Kiley pontificated at St. John's Cathedral, and preached. In the months of June and July five churches of the old Archdiocese of Milwaukee celebrated their hundredth anniversaries: St. Lawrence Church at St. Lawrence, Wisconsin; St. Bernard's Church at Watertown; St. Norbert's Church at Roxbury; St. Philip's Church at Highland, and St. Andrew's Church at Tennyson. The church at Roxbury has the distinction of having been founded by Father Albert Inama, O. Praem., who was the great friend of Catholic German immigrants in the 1840's. He bought great tracts of land and resold it at cost to the new arrivals. The church still has a painting of the Madonna which was donated to Father Inama by Louis II of Bavaria in 1848. These parish anniversaries make the West realize that Catholicity is as old in this region as the oldest settlements.

The centennial annual meeting of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin was held on August 23-24. Campion High School played host to the society for its meeting at the historic Mississippi river town. The program dealt in good measure with themes of local history in and about western Wisconsin. The historic surroundings and the hospitality of the Jesuits attracted about 700 members of the Society to the meeting.

Portland, Oregon, began on August 6 the observance of its centennial as an archdiocese, the second oldest in the United States.

The centenary of the first Benedictine foundation in the United States was celebrated September 2-4 at St. Vincent's Abbey, Latrobe, Pennsylvania.

Documents: Zwei unveröffentlichte Briefe des seligen Ludwig Sotelo, O.F.M. Dorotheus Schilling *(Antonianum,* Jan., 1945).—An Unpublished Diary of Fray Juan Crespi, O.F.M. (1770). Edited by Charles J. G. Maximin Piette *(Americas,* July).—Philadelphia and the Revolution. Trans. by Jules A. Baisnée and John J. Meng *(Records of the American Catholic Histor. Society of Phila.,* June).

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Unity of History. Theodor Haecker *(Dublin Rev.*, July).

Otto III and the Renovatio Imperii: His Neglected Synthesis for Europe. R. Arnold Jones *(ibid.)*.

Les visages de l'histoire. Damase Potvin *(Culture*, June).

Intellectual Interests in 14th and 15th Century Libraries. Pearl Kibre *(Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas*, June).

The Function of Law and Justice in the Ancient World and the Middle Ages. Anton-Hermann Chroust *(ibid.)*.

A Critique of Democracy. Erik R. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn *(New Scholasticism*, July).

La democracia como régimen político cristiano (II). Pablo G. López *(Razón y Fe*, July).

The Study of International Relations. Waldemar Gurian *(Rev. of Politics*, July).

The Road to Indian Autonomy. H. C. E. Zacharias *(ibid.)*.

The Preamble of the Charter—A Critical Analysis. Hans Kelsen *(Jrn. of Politics*, May).

The Pope and Postwar Europe. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. *(Sign*, Aug.).

Ricostruzione teologico-critica del testo latino del Vangelo di S. Luca usato da S. Ambrogio (II). G. M. Rolando *(Biblica*, Vol. 27, Fasc. 1-2).

Restitutio critica textus Latini evang. sec. Ioh. ex scriptis S. Ambrosii (I). T. Caragliano *(ibid.)*.

Public Opinion, Determination, and Free Will. William A. Gerhard *(Thomist*, April).

The Law of Nations and the Salamanca School of Theology. José Manuel de Aguilar *(ibid.)*.

The Place of Religious Sentiment in Saint Thomas. Bernard Mailhiot *(ibid.)*.

Polycarp of Smyrna. Robert M. Grant *(Anglican Theolog. Rev.*, July).

The Origin of the Epiclesis. Cyril C. Richardson *(ibid.)*.

Which Philip? Eric Bishop *(ibid.)*.

The Place of Women in Anglican Tradition (Church Congress Syllabus 43). Rose Phelps *(ibid.)*.

The Patriarchate of Alexandria: A Study in National Christianity. E. R. Hardy, Jr. *(Church Hist.*, June).

Le visage de Marie à travers les siècles dans l'art chrétien. J. Duhr *(Nouvelle revue théologique*, May).

L'Apologie de Quadratus conservée sous le titre d'Épitre à Diognète II. D. P. Andriessen *(Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, Apr.).

Questions de sotériologie médiévale. D. E. DeClerck *(ibid.)*.

Pour une édition critique du "Liber Pancrisis." D. O. Lottin *(ibid.)*.

Nouveaux fragments théologiques de l'école d'Anselme de Laon. Manuscrits de Munich. D. O. Lottin *(ibid.)*.

Anselme de Laon, auteur de la "Lettre" de S. Anselme sur la Cène. D. O. Lottin *(ibid.)*.

The "Summa Duacensis" and the Pseudo-Grosseteste's "De anima." A. Callus *(ibid.)*.

Ricerche sulle istituzioni monastiche bizantine. Typika ktetorica, caristicari e monasteri "leberi." E. Herman *(Orientalia Christiana Periodica,* 1940).

Der Rekapitulationsbegriff des heiligen Irenäus. E. Scharl *(ibid.).*

Bessarion Nicaenus in Concilio Florentino. E. Candal *(ibid.).*

Slawische "Christus-Engel" Darstellungen. A. M. Ammann *(ibid.).*

La Croix d'Herculanum? G. de Jerphanion *(ibid.,* 1941).

Der Werdegang Hergenröthers "Photius." Ein Gedenkblatt zur 50. Wiederkehr seines Todestages. W. Drammer *(ibid.).*

Der "Nestorianismus" Theodors von Mopsuestia in seiner Sakramentenlehre. W. de Vries *(ibid.).*

Problemi di teologia presso gli ortodossi. B. Schultze *(ibid.,* 1941, 1942 and 1943).

Une formule énigmatique des anaphores éthiopiennes. J. M. Hanssens *(ibid.,* 1941).

Der homiletische Nachlass des Basileios von Seleukeia. B. Marx *(ibid.).*

Où en est chez nous la doctrine de la divino-humanité de l'Eglise? S. Tyszkiewicz *(ibid.).*

Die Regelung der Armut in den byzantinischen Klöstern. E. Herman *(ibid.).*

Der hl. Johannes Klimax bei Photios. G. Hofmann *(ibid.).*

Die Ikone der Apostelfürsten in St. Peter zu Rom. W. F. Volbach *(ibid.).*

Kopten und Aethiopier auf dem Konzil von Florenz. G. Hofmann *(ibid.,* 1942).

Timotheus II. (1318-32), Ueber "die sieben Gründe der kirchlichen Geheimnisse." W. de Vries *(ibid.).*

Le Liturgicon ruthène depuis l'union de Brest. A. Raes *(ibid.).*

Thèses "orthodoxes" sur les relations entre l'Eglise et l'Etat. A. Wuyts *(ibid.).*

Zur Geschichte der Geltung der Florentiner Konzilsentscheidungen in Polen-Litauen. A. M. Ammann *(ibid.).*

La biblioteca scientifica del monastero di San Francesco a Candia nel medio evo. G. Hofmann *(ibid.).*

Die kirchlichen Einkünfte des byzantinischen Niederklerus. E. Herman *(ibid.).*

Le procès de Léon de Chalcédoine. P. Stephanou *(ibid.,* 1943).

Le due lettere di Giorgio da Trebisonda a Maometto II. A. Mercati *(ibid.).*

Panégyrique de saint Antoine par Jean, évêque d'Hermopolis. G. Garitte *(ibid.).*

Rodrigo, Dekan von Braga; Kaiser Johann VIII. Palaiologos. G. Hofmann *(ibid.).*

Opus ineditum Nili Cabasilae de Spiritus Sancti processione contra Latinos. E. Candal *(ibid.).*

Die Anreden grieschischer Patriarchenbriefe an den Papst im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit. G. Hofmann *(ibid.).*

L. P. Karsawins Ontologie der Dreieinheit. G. A. Wetter *(ibid.).*

Sull'autore del *De titulis Psalmorum* stampato fra le opere di S. Atanasio. G. Card. Mercati *(ibid.,* 1944).

Le professioni vietate al clero bizantino. E. Herman *(ibid.).*

Qas Kheder de Mossoul. J.-M. Vosté *(ibid.).*

Wie stand es mit der Frage der Kircheneinheit auf Kreta im XV. Jahrhundert? G. Hofmann *(ibid.).*

Pour la biographie du cardinal Bessarion. R. Leonertz *(ibid.).*

Un documento sconosciuto della polemica tra Greci e Latini intorno alla formula battesimale. C. Giannelli *(ibid.).*

Heliari et Masōb. Arn. van Lantschoot *(ibid.).*

I Santi dell'epoca cristiana comune nella tradizione agiografica albanese. G. Valentini *(ibid.)*.

Le Pontifical dans le rite byzantin. C. Korolevskij *(ibid.)*.

Le Récit de l'institution eucharistique dans l'anaphore chaldéenne et malabare des Apôtres. A. Raes *(ibid.)*.

La vita, le opere e i viaggi di frate Ricoldo da Montecroce O. P. U. Monneret de Villard *(ibid.)*.

Il decreto d'unione de 6 luglio 1439 nell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano. A. Mercati *(ibid.*, 1945).

Paul Bedjan, le lazariste persan. J.-M. Vosté *(ibid.)*.

Der Aufenthalt der ruthenischen Bischöfe Hypathius Pociej und Cyrillus Terlecki in Rom im Dezember und Januar 1595-1596. A. M. Ammann *(ibid.)*.

Patriarch Johann Bekkos und die lateinische Kultur. G. Hofmann *(ibid.)*.

La nuova soteriologia russa. B. Schultze *(ibid.)*.

Qui est Saint Alexis? F. Tailliez *(ibid.)*.

Les anciennes églises de Rome vues par M. Émile Mâle. G. de Jerphanion *(ibid.)*.

Notiziola sulla famiglia di Giorgio da Trebisonda. A. Mercati *(ibid.)*.

The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. Solomon Zeitlin *(Jewish Quart. Rev.*, July).

Jerusalem 201 to 199 B. C. E. on the History of a Messianic Movement. Eugene Taeubler *(ibid.)*.

Palestine in the Third and Fourth Centuries. Saul Lieberman *(ibid.)*.

Le part des papes du sixième siècle dans le développement de l'année liturgique. G. Morin *(Revue Bénédictine*, 1940).

Der Briefwechsel zwischen Abaelard und Heloise dennoch eine literarische Fiction Abaelards. B. Schmeidler *(ibid.)*.

Les livres de l'abbé Seiwold de Bath. Ph. Grierson *(ibid.)*.

La bibliothèque de Saint-Vaast d'Arras au XII[e] siècle. Ph. Grierson *(ibid.)*.

Essai d'une histoire critique des éditions générales grecques et gréco-latines de S. Basile de Césarée. D. Amand *(ibid.*, 1940, 1941 and 1942).

Bulletin d'histoire bénédictine. Ph. Schmitz *(ibid.*, 1940, 1941 and 1942).

Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine. C. Charlier and C. Lambot *(ibid.)*.

Le rite de la fraction dans la messe romaine. B. Capelle *(ibid.*, 1941).

Saint Augustin a-t-il rédigé la règle pour moines qui porte son nom? C. Lambot *(ibid.)*.

Les *Institutiones* de Cassiodore et sa fondation à Vivarium. A van de Vyver *(ibid.)*.

Le lectionnaire de Luxeuil. Ses origines et l'Église de Langres. P. Salmon *(ibid.)*.

Un théologien bénédictin oublié du XII[e] siècle: Guillaume le Français, moine de St-Bertin. G. Morin *(ibid.)*.

Quelques observations sur le recueil des poésies attribuées autrefois à Philippe de Harvengt, abbé de Bonne-Espérance. A. Boutemy *(ibid.)*.

Les homélies latines sur S. Matthieu attribuées à Origène. G. Morin *(ibid.*, 1942).

Sermon pseudo-ambrosien attribuable à S. Grégoire le Grand. C. Lambot *(ibid.)*.

Un ancien recueil de leçons pour les vigiles des défunts. J. Leclercq *(ibid.)*.

Une "lamentation" inédite de Jean de Fécamp. J. Leclercq and J. P. Bonnes *(ibid.)*.

L'office de la Fête-Dieu. Aperçus nouveaux sur ses origines. C. Lambot *(ibid.)*.

Les oeuvres complètes de saint Césaire d'Arles. C. Lambot *(ibid.)*.

Schola Dominici Servitii. Thomas Michels *(Folia,* May).

Notes on the Excavations in the Old Grottoes. Joseph Christopher *(ibid.)*.

Les sources de la "Translatio Sancti Aemiliani." B. de Gaiffier d'Hestroy *(Fasciculus quorundam studiorum F. Grat memoriae dicatus,* t.I, Paris, 1946).

Bibliographie de l'Annoniciade. Bonnefoy Jean-François *(Collectanea Franciscana,* Apr., July and Oct. 1943).

P. Agostino da Conegliano, O.F.M. Cap. Vita e Opere. Giancrisostomo da Cittadella *(ibid.,* Apr. 1943).

Manuscripta Franciscana in Italiae bibliothecis asservata. Amedeus a Zedelgem *(ibid.)*.

État des indulgences obtenues du Saint-Siège par le P. Gabriel-Maria, O.F.M. Bonnefoy Jean François *(ibid.)*.

Notae quaedam de S. Bonaventura Praedicatore. Bonaventura a Mehr *(ibid.,* Oct. 1943).

De debito peccati originalis in B. Virgine Maria. Investigationes de doctrina quam tenuit Ioannes Duns Scotus. Carolus Balić *(Antonianum,* July and Oct., 1941).

S. Bonaventura christianus philosophus. Irenaeus Squadrani *(ibid.,* July 1941).

Catalogus librorum abbatiae Sancti Adelberti Egmondanae. Willibrordus Lampen *(ibid.,* Jan. 1942).

Descriptio codicum Franciscalium necnon S. Thomae Aquin. in Bibliotheca Albornotiana Collegii Hispani Bononiae asservatorum. Caelestinus Piana *(ibid.,* Apr. 1942).

Concilii Tridentini de necessitate baptismi doctrina in decreto de justificatione. Paulus Hörger *(ibid.,* July and Oct. 1942).

Doctrina S. Ioannis Chrysostomi de Christo se offerente in Missa. Willibrordus Lampen *(ibid.,* Jan. 1943).

De anno ultimo vitae Fr. Iohannis de Marignollis Missionarii inter Tataros atque episcopi Bisinianensis. Livarius Oliger *(ibid.)*.

De relatione inter ecclesiam et statum. Adolphus Ledwolorz *(ibid.)*.

Le prologue de Roger Bacon à son traité De influentiis agentium. Ferdinandus M. Delorme *(ibid.,* Apr. 1943).

De tribus viis diversis existentiam divinam attingendi. Disquisitio historico-collativa inter S. Thomam, Henricum Gandavensem, Duns Scotum. Timotheus Barth *(ibid.)*.

Doctrina de Immaculata B. V. Mariae Conceptione apud P. Ludovicum de Carvajal. Pius Sagüés *(ibid.,* July and Oct., 1943).

De quibusdam codicibus Vindobonensibus de SS. Eucharistia tractantibus. Willibrordus Lampen *(ibid.,* July 1943).

Gnoseologia Bonaventuriana? Novatus Picard *(ibid.,* Oct., 1943).

La storia della divozione a Gesù Bambino nelle immagini plastiche isolate. Cesario Van Hulst *(ibid.,* Jan. 1944).

Descriptio Codicum Quatuor Magistrorum expositionem Regulae S. Francisci continentium. Livarius Oliger *(ibid.,* Jan. and July 1944).

De sermonibus Gaufredi Babionis, scholastici Andegavensis. Willibrordus Lampen *(ibid.,* July 1944).

L'"Ars faciendi sermonès" de Géraud du Pescher. Ferdinandus Delorme *(ibid.)*.

De spiritualitatis scholis catholicis. Gustavus Cantini *(ibid.)*.

Rector Magnificus Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis.—Venezia e l'Inquisizione Romana sotto Paolo IV e Pio IV. Pius Paschini *(ibid.*, Jan. 1945).

La leyenda del Preste Juan entre los Franciscanos de la Edad Media. Joseph Pou y Martí *(ibid.)*.

Bemerkungen zu den ersten Missionsversuchen der Franziskaner in Aethiopien. Joannes Dindinger *(ibid.)*.

Il culto di San Sebastiano a Roma nell'antichità e nel medioevo. Benedictus Pesci *(ibid.)*.

Deux prétendus biographes de saint Dominique frère Justin et Frère Conrad. Thomas Käppeli *(ibid.)*.

De S. Bernardini Senensis formatione scientifica. Liberatus Di Stolfi *(ibid.)*.

De critica textuali Scholasticorum scriptis accommodata. Carolus Balić *(ibid.)*.

Mitteilungen über franziskanische Handschriften in Dänemark und Skandinavien. Willibrordus Lampen *(ibid.)*.

Manoscritti e incunabuli del convento di S. Bernardino dell'Aquila trasferiti alla R. Biblioteca Borbonica di Napoli nel 1789. Anicetus Chiappini *(ibid.)*.

"Pie Pelicane Jesu Domine." Willibrordus Lampen *(ibid.*, Jan. 1946).

Santo Antônio, "Doctor Evangelicus." Boaventuria Kloppenburg *(Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, June).

Ockham's Theory of Signification. Philotheus Boehner *(Franciscan Studies*, June).

A Special Aspect of Athanasian Soteriology—II. Dominic Unger *(ibid.)*.

The *Abbreviatio* of the *Oxoniense* of Scotus by Rogerius Anglicus. Gaudens E. Mohan *(ibid.)*.

Commentary: *Ioannis Duns Scoti Tractatus de Primo Principio*. Sebastian Day *(ibid.)*.

Franciscana Notes. John M. Lenhart *(ibid.)*.

Capuchin Legislation: 1537-1552. Demetrius Manousos *(Round Table of Franciscan Research*, Jan.).

Anselm of Pietramolara and His Companions, Capuchin Chaplains. Gall Higgins *(ibid.)*.

The First Sixteen Capuchin Elections. Demetrius Manousos *(ibid.)*.

The Theoretical Attitude Towards Space in the Middle Ages. Robert Grinnell *(Speculum*, Apr.).

The Beginnings of the Ecclesiatical Tithe in Italy. Catherine E. Boyd *(ibid.)*.

The *Esplumoir Merlin:* A Study in its Cabalistic Sources. Helen Adolf *(ibid.)*.

The Choristers' Lament. Francis Lee Utley *(ibid.)*.

The Mass Conversion of Jews in Southern Italy (1290-1294). Joshua Starr *(ibid.)*.

Caxton's *Golden Legend* and Varagine's *Legenda Aurea*. Sister Mary Jeremy *(ibid.)*.

A Note on Michael Choniates, Archbishop of Athens (1182-1204). Kenneth M. Setton *(ibid.)*.

The Noun *Mena* in the *Divine Comedy*. H. D. Austin *(ibid.)*.

Robertus Anglicus and the Introduction of Demons and Magic into Commentaries upon the *Sphere* of Sacrobosco. Lynn Thorndike *(ibid.)*.

Manuscript Photoreproductions in Classical, Mediaeval, and Renaissance Research. Loren C. MacKinney *(ibid.)*.

Charlemagne and Roland and the Auchinleck MS. H. M. Smyster *(ibid.*, July).

Mediaeval Laughter. J. S. P. Tatlock *(ibid.)*.

The Legend of Boethius' Martyrdom. William Bark *(ibid.)*.

Petrus Comestor, Methodius, and the Saracens. Marbury B. Ogle *(ibid.)*.

Two Hymns on St. Judocus. Millett Henshaw *(ibid.)*.

Fifteenth Century Editions of the *Legenda Aurea*. Robert Francis Seybolt *(ibid.)*.

The *Legenda Aurea*, Bible, and *Historia Scholastica*. Robert Francis Seybolt *(ibid.)*.

The Bridge of Judgment in the *Fioretti*. Howard R. Patch *(ibid.)*.

The Earliest Norman Counts. David Douglas *(English Histor. Rev.*, May).

A Medieval Document on Papal Theories of Government. W. Ullmann *(ibid.)*.

L'humanisme averroïste en France et les sources du rationalisme. Thomas Greenwood *(Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Apr.).

El constitutivo formal de la persona creada en la tradición tomista. Francisco P. Muñiz *(La Ciencia Tomista*, Apr.).

Santo Domingo de Guzmán, fundador de la primera orden universitaria, Apostólica y misionera. Venancio D. Carro *(ibid.*, July).

Carácter Jerárquico de Tito, Timoteo, Silas, Lucas y otros compañeros de San Paplo. Lorenzo Turrado *(ibid.)*.

The Strange Fame of Demetrio Canevari, Philosopher and Physician, Genoese Patrician (1559-1625) [papal archiater]. George Sarton *(Jrn. of the Hist. of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, July).

The Medici Bank: Organization and Management. Raymond de Roover *(Jrn. of Economic Hist.*, May).

Introduction of the Episcopal Church into the Hawaiian Islands. Ralph S. Kuykendall *(Pacific Histor. Rev.*, June).

The Periodization of Chinese History. Meribeth E. Cameron *(ibid.)*.

EUROPEAN

Le parti catholique belge, de ses origines à 1884. E. de Moreau *(Nouvelle revue théologique*, May).

The Rebirth of Italy. Don Luigi Sturzo *(Sign*, Aug.).

Ambrose Baber at the Court of Sardinia (1841-1843). Howard R. Marraro *(Georgia Histor. Quart.*, June).

Los generales de la orden Capuchina grandes de España de primera clase. Melchor de Pobladura *(Collectanea Franciscana*, July 1943).

I Cappuccini a Belluno. Giancrisostomo da Cittadella *(ibid.*, Oct. 1943).

A Catholic Champion from Germany: Friedrich Muckermann, S.J. (1883-1946). B. S. Farrell *(Month*, July).

Pan-Slav and Pan-German: A Parallel History of Ideas. Béla Menczer *(Month*, May).

The Tragedy of Poland. John Murray *(Studies*, June).

Ukraine—Between Poland and Russia. Nicholas D. Czubatyj *(Rev. of Politics*, July).

Germany Today. Clara Menck *(ibid.)*.

The Economics of Potsdam. Ferdinand A. Hermens *(ibid.)*.

The Future of European Freedom. Watson Kirkconnell *(Ukrainian Quart.*, Spring).

Why I Do Not Want to Go "Home." Ivan Bahryany *(ibid.)*.

The World of Freedom and the World of Tyranny. Lev E. Dobriansky *(ibid.)*.

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Religious Principle in *Beowulf*. Marie Padgett Hamilton *(Pmla*, June).

Manly's Conception of the Early History of the *Canterbury Tales*. Germaine Dempster *(ibid.)*.

Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers. Haldeen Braddy *(Speculum*, Apr.).

Did Chaucer Revise the *Clerk's Tale*? J. Burke Severs *(Speculum*, July).

Les mélanges de Mathieu préchantre de Rievaulx au début du XIII^e^ siècle. A. Wilmart *(Revue Bénédictine*, 1940).

Thomas de Wykes and his Chronicle. N. Denholm-Young *(English Histor. Rev.*, May).

Lollard Opposition to Oaths by Creatures. Henry G. Russell *(Amer. Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Carthusians of Coventry. Tudor Edwards *(Pax*, Summer, 1946).

Manuscript Material for the Study of Tudor and Stuart English. Hilda Hulme *(Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Apr.).

The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660. William Raleigh Trimble *(Jrn. of Mod. Hist.*, June).

British Diplomacy in the Light of Anglo-Spanish New World Issues, 1750-1757. Lawrence Henry Gipson *(Amer. Histor. Rev.*, July).

Newman and German Catholicism. Paul Simon *(Dublin Rev.*, July).

Newman théologien. Jean-Charles Laframboise *(Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July).

Theobold Wolfe Tone Dillon: 1898-1946. Gerard Murphy *(Studies*, June).

John Maynard Keynes: 1883-1946. George O'Brien *(ibid.)*.

Michael Davitt: Survey and Appreciation. T. W. Moody *(ibid.)*.

Jeremiah J. Callanan: His Life. B. G. MacCarthy *(ibid.)*.

Recent Research on Irish Hagiography. Ludwig Bieler *(ibid.)*.

Bishop Calloner. Denis Gwynn *(ibid.)*.

Dictionary of Irishmen in France. Richard Hayes *(ibid.)*.

AMERICAN

Two World Wars and American Historical Scholarship. William C. Binkley *(Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, June).

History in the Liberal Arts Colleges. Fremont P. Wirth *(ibid.)*.

Twentieth Century Theories of the Nature of the Union. Walter H. Bennett *(Jrn. of Politics*, May).

The Foreigner as Soldier in the Second World War, I. Alfred Vagts *(ibid.)*.

American Political Philosophy after 1865. Charles N. R. McCoy *(Thought*, June).

The Agrarian Democracy of Thomas Jefferson. A. Whitney Griswold *(Amer. Pol. Science Rev.*, Aug.).

The Constitutional Theories of Thomas Paine. John J. Meng *(Rev. of Politics*, July).

John A. Ryan: Prophet of Social Justice. Richard J. Purcell *(Studies,* June).

The Missionary March of the American Episcopal Church, 1789-1835. E. Clowes Chorley *(Histor. Mag.,* Sept.).

Yesterday and Tomorrow in Ohio. Roy F. Nichols *(Ohio State Archaeological and Histor. Quart.,* July).

Bishop Neumann's German Catechism. J. M. Lenhart *(Social Justice Rev.,* July).

German Catholic Settlements in Ohio, 1834-1844. John M. Lenhart *(Social Justice Rev.,* Sept.).

German Influence in the Churches and Schools of Dubois County, Indiana. Elfrieda Lang *(Indiana Mag. of Hist.,* June).

Articles on the Poles in America. *(Polish American Studies,* Jan.).

History of the Assumption B.V.M. Province. Cyril Piontek and Fulgence Masiak *(Chronicle* of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary Province [O.F.M.] Pulaski, Wisconsin, Jan.).

The Missouri Reader: The French in the Valley, Part IV. Ed. by Dorothy Penn *(Missouri Histor. Rev.,* July).

The Narrative of Oscar One Bull. Sister M. Inez Hilger *(Mid-America,* July).

The "Récit des Voyages et des Découvertes du Père Jacques Marquette." Jean Delanglez *(ibid.).*

La famille Cherrier de Saint-Denis-sur-Richelieu. Henri Morisseau *(Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July).

Bilingual Canada and the World. Gordon O. Rothney *(Culture,* June).

Les Archives du Saint-Siège importantes sources de l'histoire politico-religieuse du Canada. Conrad Morin *(ibid.).*

History and National Life. Jean Bruchési *(ibid.).*

Breve Compendio de los ritos idolátricos de Nueva España, auctore Bernardino de Sahagún O.F.M., Pio V dicatum (cum Tabula). Livarius Oliger *(Antonianum,* Jan. and Apr. 1942).

Le Saint-Siège et la juridiction des fondateurs de la mission du Canada. Conradus Morin *(ibid.,* Jan. 1945).

De Fr. Alphonso de Benavides Novi Mexici missionario. Livarius Oliger *(ibid.,* Jan. 1946).

Materials in the National Archives for the History of New Mexico before 1848. Ralph G. Lounsbury *(New Mexico Histor. Rev.,* July).

The Gabriel Moraga Expedition of 1806: The Diary of Fray Pedro Muñoz. Edited by Robert G. Cleland *(Huntington Library Quart.,* May).

Historical Sketch of the Bernalillo Public High School, 1891-1945. Sister M. Lilliana Owens *(Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.,* June).

Tres norteamericanos y su participación en el desarrollo del Tratado McLane-Ocampo, 1856-1860. Paul Murray *(Estudios históricos,* Apr.).

El Guadalupanismo del Excmo. Sr. Labastida Arzobispo de México. Pedro J. Sánchez *(Christus,* July).

Viceroy Francisco de Toledo and the Just Titles of Spain to the Inca Empire. Lewis Hanke *(Americas,* July).

A Mexican Personalist: Antonio Caso (1883-1946). Kurt F. Reinhardt *(ibid.).*

Requena and the Japurá: Some Eighteenth-Century Watercolors of the Amazon and Other Rivers. Robert C. Smith *(ibid.)*.

Literary Contributions of Catholics in Nineteenth-Century Mexico. Francis Borgia Steck *(ibid.)*.

Two Unknown Manuscripts Belonging to Early California. Charles J. G. Maximin Piette *(ibid.)*.

Capuchin Champions of Negro Emancipation in Cuba, (1681-1685). John M. Lenhart *(Franciscan Studies,* June).

Biografía del Don Pedro Valera y Gimenez [1757-1833], arzobispo metropolitano de Santo Domingo, por José María Morillas. Ed. by Max H. Ureña *(Clio, Revista de la Acad. Dominicana de la Historia,* Jan. 1945).

Doctor Don José de Cáceres por J. M. Morillas. *Idem. (ibid.)*.

The Founding of the City of Gracias a Dios, First Seat of the Audiencia de los Confines. Robert S. Chamberlain *(Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.,* Feb.).

Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism in South America. S. Fanny Simon *(ibid.)*.

Problemas de nuestro derecho internacional público. Agustín Tijerino R. *(Universidad de Antioquia,* Jan.).

O Dilúvio na mitologia dos índios sul-americanos. Valter Kempf *(Vozes de Petrópolis,* Mar.).

Frei Veloso entre os índios. Frei Odulfo, O.F.M. *(ibid.)*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bernanos, Georges, *Joy*, trans. by Louise Varese. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1946. Pp. 297. $2.75.)

Burgin, Miron, *Economic Aspects of Argentine Federalism.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1946. Pp. xiv, 304. $4.00.)

Burroughs, Betty (Ed.), *Vasari's Lives of the Artists: Biographies of the Most Eminent Architects, Painters, and Sculptors of Italy.* (New York: Simon and Schuster. 1946. Pp. xv, 309. $3.75.)

Carré, Meyrick H., *Realists and Nominalists.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1946. Pp. vi, 128. $2.75.)

Destler, Chester McArthur, *American Radicalism, 1865-1901: Essays and Documents.* (New London: Connecticut College. 1946. Pp. xii, 276. Cloth, $3.50. Paper, $2.50.)

Ducey, Michael, O.S.B. (Ed.), *National Liturgical Week. Held at the Cathedral of Saint Louis, New Orleans, Louisiana. December 11-13, 1945.* (Peotone, Illinois: Liturgical Conference, Inc. 1946. Pp. vii, 202.) The sixth volume of a series containing the papers and discussions of the annual liturgical week conference.

Eliot, Ethel Cook, *Roses for Mexico.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1946. Pp. 119. $1.75.) A story built around the theme of our Lady of Guadalupe.

Ford, J. Edward, *David Rittenhouse: Astronomer-Patriot, 1732-1796.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1946. Pp. viii, 226. $2.50.)

Foss, Martin, *The Idea of Perfection in the Western World.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1946. Pp. 102. $1.50.)

Garvin, Joseph N., *The Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeretensium.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1946. Pp. vii, 567. $5.75.) Improved text and English translation of this famous, but little studied account. There are a wealth of historical notes and a detailed study of the language that will be a boon to students in history struggling with the Latin of the period.

Hall, Walter Phelps, *Iron out of Calvary: an Interpretative History of the Second World War.* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc. 1946. Pp. vii, 389. $3.00.)

Hoffman, Frederick J., Charles Allen and Carolyn F. Ulrich, *The Little Magazine: A History and a Bibliography.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1946. Pp. ix, 440. $3.75.)

Hoole, W. Stanley, *The Ante-Bellum Charleston Theatre.* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press. 1946. Pp. xx, 230. $3.50.)

Howes, Jane, *Slow Dawning.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1946. Pp. xiv, 268. $3.00.)

Jacks, L. V., *Claude Dubuis, Bishop of Galveston.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1946. Pp. ix, 268. $2.50.)

Jamison, James K., *By Cross and Anchor: The Story of Frederick Baraga on Lake Superior.* (Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press. 1946. Pp. xi, 225. $2.50.)

Jordan, Philip D., *Singing Yankees.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1946. Pp. xi, 305. $3.50.)

Kane, W., S.J., *Paradise Hunters.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1946. Pp. v, 291. $3.00.) A series of essays on every-day problems of life from the view of the Christian philosophy of life.

Kleist, James A., *The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch.* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Book Shop. 1946. Pp. ix, 162. $2.50.)

Kuttner, Stephanus, *Decreta septem priorum sessionum concilii Tridentini sub Paulo III Pont. Max.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1946. Pp. xliii, 24. $5.00.)

Lamb, Harold, *Alexander of Macedon: The Journey to World's End.* (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc. 1946. Pp. viii, 402. $3.50.)

LeDuc, Thomas, *Piety and Intellect at Amherst College, 1865-1912.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1946. Pp. ix, 165. $2.00.)

Levison, Wilhelm, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1946. Pp. xii, 347. $5.00.)

Maass, Edgar, *Imperial Venus: A Novel of Napoleon's Favorite Sister.* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. 1946. Pp. 421. $3.00.)

McKinley, Silas B. and Silas Bent, *Old Rough and Ready: The Life and Times of Zachary Taylor.* (New York: Vanguard Press. 1946. Pp. 329. $3.00.)

Most, William G., *The Syntax of the Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1946. Pp. xxv, 356. $4.00.) This is Volume XX of the University's Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature.

Newmann, Sigmung, *The Future in Perspective.* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1946. Pp. x, 406.)

Noble, Ransom E., *New Jersey Progressivism before Wilson.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1946. Pp. ix, 175. $2.00.)

Nock, Sister Frances Clare, *The Vita Sancti Fructuosi.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1946. Pp. vii, 163. $1.75.) A critical edition of this quaint little hagiographical account along with a careful English translation of its crude Latinity. A hundred pages of introduction and notes are devoted to the problems of the *Vita* and to the life and cult of this great Spanish religious founder and bishop.

O'Connell, Laurence J., *Are Catholic Schools Progressive?* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1946. Pp. ix, 167. $1.75.)

Pickl, Josef [Trans. by Andrew Green], *The Messias.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1946. Pp. ix, 333. $4.00.)

Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research. Vol. XV. (New York: American Academy for Jewish Research. 1945. Pp. xviii, 129.) Besides the membership lists, officers, and reports of the Academy, this volume contains the second installments of two studies, viz., "Jewish Monuments of the Middle Ages in Germany," by Adolf Kober, and "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry," by Bernard L Weinryb.

Report of the Delegation of the United States of America to the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, Mexico City, Mexico, February 21-March 8, 1945. (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1946. Pp. iii, 371.)

Schwarzenberg, Adolph, *Prince Felix zu Schwarzenberg, Prime Minister of Austria, 1848-1852.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1946. Pp. xviii, 244. $3.50.)

Shaw, P. E., *The Catholic Apostolic Church, Sometimes Called Irvingite: A Historical Study.* (New York: Kings Crown Press. 1946. Pp. viii, 264. $3.25.)

A Short Survey of Social Assistance Work in Portugal (1128-1945). (Lisbon: Comp. E. Imp. na Tipografia da Emprêsa Nacional de Publicidade. 1945. Pp. 167.) A well illustrated short survey of social assistance work in Portugal. The historical aspect of the volume is sketchy and not documented.

Sperry, Willard L., *Religion in America.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1946. Pp. xi, 318. $2.50.)

Steward, Julian H. (Ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians.* [Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 143.] Volume I, *The Marginal Tribes;* Volume II, *The Andean Civilizations.* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1946. Pp. xix, 624; xxxiii, 1035. $2.75; $4.25.) These two volumes carry numerous charts, illustrations, and bibliographies. A generous section of Volume I has been written by Professor John M. Cooper of the Catholic University of America.

Stewart, Watt, *Henry Meiggs: Yankee Pizarro.* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1946. Pp. ix, 370. $4.00.)

Swanton, John R., *The Indians of the Southeastern United States.* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1946. Pp. xiii, 943. $2.75.) This exhaustive volume is Bulletin 37 of the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology. The volume is enriched by thirteen maps, 107 plates, and five text figures.

Tansill, Charles C., *The Congressional Career of Thomas Francis Bayard, 1869-1885.* (Washington: Georgetown University Press. 1946. Pp. 362.)

Timasheff, Nicholas S., *The Great Retreat: The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia.* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. 1946. Pp. 470. $5.00.)

Ullmann, Walter, *The Medieval Idea of Law as Represented by Lucas de Penna.* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd. 1946. Pp. xxxix, 220.)

Vasiliev, Alexander A., *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860.* (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1946. Pp. xii, 245. $4.00. Members of Academy, $3.20.)

Visita y reforma de los hospitales de San Juan de Dios de Nueva España en 1772-1774. I and II. (Mexico: Selección de Romulo Velasco Ceballos. 1945. Pp. viii, 165; 283.)

Willging, Eugene P., *The Index to American Catholic Pamphlets.* Vol. III. (August, 1942-May, 1946.) (Scranton: University of Scranton. 1946. Pp. xviii, 707. $1.25.) This third volume of the *Index* includes approximately 650 titles of new puplications or revisions of older titles, an historical sketch of American Catholic pamphlet publishers, a directory of publishers, and a brief description of the pamphlets under classified headings. It should prove very useful to librarians and general readers.

CONTRIBUTORS TO ARTICLES AND MISCELLANY

Hilmar C. Krueger is an assistant professor of history at the University of Cincinnati. He took his undergraduate work at Northwestern College, Watertown, Wisconsin, and received his doctor's degree in history at the University of Wisconsin in 1932. His field of research is mediaeval economic history, primarily Genoese-Arab relations. He has contributed articles to *Speculum*, the *Catholic Historical Review*, and other historical journals, and is engaged in editing source material.

John J. Meng, president of the American Catholic Historical Association during 1945, is chairman of the Department of Political Science in Queens College, of the College of the City of New York. He is the author of two books and numerous articles on Franco-American diplomatic relations. For the past ten years he has been engaged in preparing the *Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris* for the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

John Tracy Ellis is associate professor of American church history in the Catholic University of America and author of the recently published volume, *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America*.